Teacher Evaluation Policy Implementation

John M. Burger

Alberta Education

Alberta
EDUCATION

88-02816/

PLEASE NOTE

THE VIEWS AND RECOMMENDATIONS PRESENTED
IN THIS REPORT ARE THOSE OF THE RESEARCHER AND
NOT NECESSARILY THOSE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

TEACHER EVALUATION POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

John M. Burger

Under Contract to Alberta Education, Edmonton, Alberta
October, 1987

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sincere appreciation is expressed to the following individuals who provided assistance, advice, encouragement or otherwise made the task of completing this study possible:

Mr. David King, the former Alberta Minister of Education who facilitated the study greatly through his cooperation and advice in the early stages of the study;

Dr. Clarance Rhodes who provided advice and reaction in the early design stages of the study;

Dr. Warren Hathaway, Planning Secretariat, Alberta Education, who acted as the liaison officer for the study;

Dr. R. Bosetti, Dr. E. Hawkesworth, Dr. W.R. Duke, Dr. J. Hrabi, Dr. S. Odynak, Dr. M. Fenske, Dr. N. Hrynyk, and Mr. G. Zatko who provided excellent cooperation in the phase I interviews;

the teachers, principals and central office personnel who participated in the phase II interviews and shared their vision of teacher evaluation;

Dr. E. Ratsoy, Dr. E. Miklos, Dr. C. Bumbarger, Dr. R. Carney, and Dr. K. Ward of the Faculty of Education, University of Alberta who provided excellent advice as the study evolved;

my wife, Nancy, and children, Jessica, Julia and Joshua whose patience, support and sacrifices are deeply appreciated.

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the degree of teacher evaluation policy implementation in Alberta, the events which influenced teacher evaluation policy adoption and the variables which affected the policy implementation process.

The information required for the study was secured through interviews and documents analysis. The first phase of the study was primarily qualitative, using semi-structured interviews of selected key decision makers and leaders in teacher evaluation in Alberta. Snowball sampling with key leaders and decision makers was used to identify a sample of these key individuals. That is, the first person interviewed, a former Minister of Education for Alberta, was asked to recommend others (Bogdan and Biklen, 1982:66). A primary purpose of this phase was to identify the historical background, the purposes and intents of teacher evaluation policy visualized in the policy planning stage, and to determine the educational leaders' perceptions of the degree of implementation of teacher evaluation policy in the province of Alberta.

In addition, 30 teachers, 30 principals and 30 superintendents or their designates were interviewed regarding their perceptions of teacher evaluation policy implementation. Phase II interview schedules with policy implementors were determined by findings from phase I interviews with policy makers and by the variable clusters from a policy implementation model

(Van Horn and Van Meter, 1977). Thirty of 146 active Alberta school jurisdictions were randomly selected from the Alberta School Jurisdiction List, 1986 for inclusion in this study. In order to assure a representative sample of jurisdictions, the population of jurisdictions was stratified on the basis of type of jurisdiction and geographic zone. Jurisdictions were then selected from each stratified grouping using a random numbers table.

Among the key recommendations from the study were:

1) the often held perspective of local policy implementors that teacher evaluation policy adoption by the Alberta Department of Education was a short term reaction to a single event, the Keegstra affair, should be corrected with the view that policy adoption was a more legitimate long term reaction to multiple factors;

2) provincial policy objectives should be adjusted to recognize and support the more formative emphasis teacher evaluation has been given at the local level;

3) given the finding that implementors perceived provincial commitment dissipating, provincial interventions are needed to maintain a climate in which teacher evaluation policy implementation is perceived as being important;

4) given the finding that lack of time was frequently mentioned as a barrier to implementation, recognition that implementors may need assistance in more efficient use of their time to support teacher evaluation policy should become a priority of jurisdictions and the Department of Education;

5) given the finding that articulation between the five provincial evaluation policies was often perceived by implementors to be unclear, the Department of Education should review the five provincial evaluation policies included in the Management and Finance Plan in order to define an optimal, articicluated relationship between the five policies;

6) given the finding that teachers report less involvement in policy development than perceived by administrators, as part of a policy and instruments review process, mechanisms should be considered which maximize teacher involvement in the process in order to increase the sense of teacher ownership of teacher evaluation policies and processes;

7) given the finding that administrator implementors appear to feel a need to demonstrate a degree of implementation that is not congruent with the expectations of the policy makers, clarification of realistic timelines for full implementation by policy makers would be useful.

The study also included a documents analysis of teacher evaluation policies and teacher evaluation instruments from the 30 jurisdictions included in the study. The analysis of these documents present useful analytical frameworks for jurisdictions to conduct reviews of their present policies and evaluation instruments.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One - Teacher Evaluation Policy Implementation

Introduction.. 1
Statement of the Problem.............................. 3
Significance of the Study............................. 5
    Research and Theory............................... 5
    Potential Contributions to Practice............... 7
Definitions... 9
Delimitations... 10
Limitations and Assumptions........................... 10

Chapter Two - Review of Related Literature

Introduction..12
Organizational Theory and Teacher Evaluation.. ..12
Societal Contexts of Teacher Evaluation..........17
Recent Studies of Teacher Evaluation.............21
Summary...27

Chapter Three - Research Design and Methodology

Introduction..28
Research Design and Methodology...................28
Phase II Interview Schedules and Variable Clusters.....30
Validity Concerns.....................................30
Sampling Procedure....................................32
Summary...33

Chapter Four - Conditions Affecting Policy Adoption and Implementation

Introduction..35
Interview Targets and Structure...................36
Events Affecting Teacher Evaluation Policy Adoption.....37
Events Affecting Teacher Evaluation Policy Implementation.....42
Policy Intents of Teacher Evaluation.............45
Social Structures and Informal Networks..........45
Idealized Policy Intents..........................46
Current Status and Possible Future Outcomes......47
Summary and Conclusions...........................48

Chapter Five - Policy Intents, Standards and Resources

Introduction..53
Policy Intents at the Provincial Level...........53
Policy Intents at the Jurisdictional Level.......58
Policy Intents - A Summary........................61
Policy Standards......................................62

Policy Resources..................................64
General Impressions of Policy Implementors.......65
Summary and Conclusions..........................67

Chapter Six - The Effects of Five Process Variables on Teacher Evaluation Policy Implementation

Introduction.....................................70
Communications................................... 70
Enforcements.....................................74
Characteristics of the Implementing Agency.......79
Political Environments...........................87
Socio-Economic Environments......................90
Summary and Conclusions..........................91

Chapter Seven - Disposition of the Implementors, Policy Effects, and Anticipated Future Needs

Introduction.....................................94
Dispostion of the Implementors...................94
Policy Effects...................................105
Expectations for Full Implementation.............109
Anticipated Future Outcomes......................111
Summary and Conclusions..........................115

Chapter Eight - Analysis of Policy Documents and Evaluation Instruments

Introduction.....................................119
Policy Documents Analysis........................119
Underlying Philosophy.........................120
Policy Purpose and Intents....................122
Role Responsibilities.........................124
Guidelines and Procedures.....................125
Appeal Procedures.............................130
Policy Documents Analysis Summary................133
Teacher Evaluation Instruments...................135
Congruence with Policy Implementation............138
Summary and Conclusions..........................139

Chapter Nine - Summary, Conclusions and Implications

Introduction.....................................144
Summary of the Study.............................144
Research Design and Methodology...............145
Conditions Affecting Policy Adoption..........148
Conditions Affecting Policy Implementation.149
Social Structures and Informal Networks....152
Policy Intents................................152
Policy Standards and Resources................153
General Impressions of the Policy Implementors....................................154
Process Variable Effects on Implementation.154
Communications............................155
Enforcements..............................155
Characteristics of the Implementing Agency....................................156
Political Environments....................157

        Socio-Economic Environments...........157
    Disposition of the Implementors............158
    Policy Effects...........................160
    Expectations for Full Implementation.......161
    Future Adjustments.........................163
    Analysis of Teacher Evaluation Policies....164
    Analysis of Teacher Evaluation Instruments.165
    Policy and Instrument Congruence with study Findings.................................167
  Recommendations for Theory....................168
  Recommendations for Practice..................169
  Recommendations for Further Research..........173
  Final Comment.................................174

Bibliography....................................175

Appendix A. Phase II Interview Schedule-Teachers...187

Appendix B. Phase II Interview Schedule-Principals.189

Appendix C. Phase II Interview Schedule-Superintendents.........................191

Appendix D. Correspondence to Superintendents Requesting Participation in the Study..194

Appendix E. Correspondence From Dr. Earle Hawkesworth to Alberta school superintendents.......................196

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Description	Page
1.	Distribution of Participating Jurisdictions by Zone and Type of Jurisdiction	33
2.	Phase II Respondent Identified Provincial Level Policy Intents	56
3.	Phase II Respondent Identified Jurisdictional Level Policy Intents	59
4.	Phase II Respondent Identified Teacher Involvement in Policy Development - Communications Variable	71
5.	Phase II Respondent Identified Policy Expectations - Communications Variable	73
6.	Phase II Respondent Identified Means Used to Encourage Teacher Cooperation with Teacher Evaluation Policy - Enforcements Variable	75
7.	Phase II Respondent Identified Means Used to Encourage Principal Cooperation with Teacher Evaluation Policy - Enforcements Variable	76
8.	Phase II Respondent Identified Training Provided to Teachers - Characteristics of the Implementing Agency Variable	81
9.	Phase II Respondent Identified Training Provided to Principals - Characteristics of the Implementing Agency Variable	82
10.	Phase II Respondent Identified Satisfaction with Methods Used to Measure Teacher Performance - Characteristics of the Implementing Agency Variable	85
11.	Phase II Respondent Identified Jurisdictional Political Effect on Policy Implementation - Political Environment Variable	88
12.	Phase II Respondent Identified Jurisdictional Attempts to Inform Parents about Teacher Evaluation Policy Implementation - Political Environment Variable	89

13. Phase II Respondent Identified Sources of Teacher Resistance to Implementation of Teacher Evaluation Policy - Disposition of the Implementors Variable 96

14. Phase II Respondent Identified Sources of Adminstrator Resistance to Implementation of Teacher Evaluation Policy - Disposition of the Implementors Variable 98

15. Phase II Respondent Perceptions of Departmental Commitment to Implementation of Teacher Evaluation Policy - Disposition of the Implementors Variable 101

16. Phase II Respondent Identified Indicators of Successful Implementation of Teacher Evaluation Policy 107

17. Phase II Respondent Identified Future Needs, Supports or Adjustments Necessary for Successful Implementation of Teacher Evaluation Policy 112

18. Underlying Philosophies Identified in the Analysis of Policy Documents 120

19. Purposes and Intents Identified in the Analysis of Policy Documents 122

20. Guidelines and Procedures Identified in the Analysis of Policy Documents 125

21. Staff Evaluation Schedules Identified in the Analysis of Policy Documents 126

22. Appeal Procedures Identified in the Analysis of Policy Documents 130

23. Teacher Evaluation Instrument Formats Identified in the Analysis of Evaluation Instruments 135

24. Teacher Evaluation Instrument Structures and Contents Identified in the Analysis of Evaluation Instruments 136

CHAPTER ONE

Teacher Evaluation Policy Implementation

Introduction

Governmental and societal concerns for excellence and accountability in education are evidenced by mandated evaluation strategies required of school jurisdictions. Numerous reports and studies in recent years, the most notable, A Nation At Risk (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century (Carnegie Task Force, 1986) and Tomorrow's Teachers (Holmes Group, 1986) have questioned the effectiveness of schools and the capabilities of teachers. Within Canada and in Alberta specifically, reports have focused on student achievement levels (Alberta Education, 1979), on teacher education (Alberta Education, 1984a) and on teacher evaluation (Alberta Education, 1984b).

Concerns regarding the quality of education are often translated into policy initiatives by state or provincial departments of education. Policies adoption, however, does not guarantee implementation. In fact, recent research on policy implementation has revealed the process to be complex, interactive and fraught with numerous barriers. Policy implementation studies based on comprehensive policy implementation models can help explicate and clarify the variables and processes important to policy implementation in support of educational reform.

This study investigates the implementation of teacher evaluation policy in Alberta, Canada. An integral part of the Alberta Department of Education's Management and Finance Plan (MFP) is an evaluative feedback loop focusing upon five levels of school jurisdiction operation: student, teacher, program, school and school system.

The purpose of teacher evaluation in Alberta is elaborated in the Department of Education's Program Policy Manual (1984:69) which states ". . . use [of] the results of evaluations [is] to improve further the quality of education. . . ." Policy regarding teacher evaluation as specified in the Program Policy Manual (1984:72) is as follows:

> The performance of individual teachers and the quality of teaching practices across the province will be evaluated to assist in the provision of effective instruction to students and in the professional growth and development of teachers.

The Alberta Department of Education places primary responsibility for teacher evaluation processes with the school jurisdiction, but specifies that local policies will complement provincial policy, primarily with respect to due process procedures.

Public and governmental efforts to monitor the internal processes of teaching represent a complex undertaking. The scale of the task leads one to suspect that the capacity of the teaching profession to buffer itself from change by virtue of its size and technical complexity is a very real possibility. On the other hand, well designed, carefully planned and implemented teacher evaluation policy which is incorporated into the organizational culture of the schools holds the promise of increasing the effectiveness of schools and thus positively affecting the morale and professional stature of the teaching profession.

The educational community in Alberta is confronted with the need to implement regular teacher evaluation mandated by provincial policy, but implementation is clouded by the complexities of policy processes. Teacher evaluation policy implementation should be seen as a long term endeavor, requiring coordination and cooperation among all stakeholder groups. An analysis of the political, bureaucratic and technical dynamics of implementing policy on teacher evaluation will help to define and support the policy implementation process.

Statement of the Problem

This study is designed to determine the degree of teacher evaluation policy implementation in Alberta and to investigate the variables which influence the policy implementation process. The essential questions and sub-questions to be addressed include the following.

1. What events affected teacher evaluation policy adoption and implementation in Alberta?

    a. What were the policy intents held by the policy makers?

b. What social structures or informal networks affected the policy process?

c. What were the anticipated ideal policy intents of the policy makers?

d. What were the perceptions of policy makers of the current status and possible future outcomes of teacher evaluation policy?

2. What were the perceived policy intents held by policy implementors and were perceptions of intents between policy makers and implementors congruent?

3. To what degree have policy standards and resources affected teacher evaluation policy implementation?

4. To what degree have communications, enforcements, characteristics of the implementing agencies, political environment, and socio-economic environment variables affected teacher evaluation policy implementation?

5. To what degree has the disposition of implementors variable affected policy implementation?

6. What were the policy effects perceived by policy implementors and were perceptions of effects between policy makers and implementors congruent?

7. How similar were the expectations of policy makers and implementors for full implementation of teacher evaluation policy?

8. What future adjustments to teacher evaluation policy implementation were perceived to be needed by policy makers and policy implementors?

9. What were the similarities and differences evident in Alberta school jurisdiction's teacher evaluation policies and instruments, and were the written teacher evaluation policies and instruments supported by the study findings?

Answers to question one are found in Chapter Four. Questions two and three are addressed in Chapter Five and question four is discussed in Chapter Six. Questions five through eight are dealt with in Chapter Seven and question nine is covered in Chapter Eight.

Significance of the Study

This study is seen to have significance for research and theory development and for the practice of policy implementation in educational settings. A consideration of the potential contributions of the study for research and theory and for practice is presented next.

Research and Theory

Scheirer and Rezmovic (1983:620-621) suggest, "For policy innovation, the definition of full implementation may be essentially a political decision." Given the potential for non-rational factors affecting policy implementation, Scheirer and Rezmovic (1983:621) recommend, "Ideally a definition [of policy intents] is put into researchable terms after consultation with legislators, policy administrators and local service deliverers."

Other authors, including Newcombe and Conrad (1981), Hansen (1983), Elmore (1979) Van Horn and Van Meter (1977), also argue for a divergent analysis of policy implementation and suggest that multiple perspectives, such as organizational behavior, planned change and educational politics are useful frameworks for analyzing policy implementation.

Several authors, Dror, (1981), Berman, (1978), O'Toole, (1986) have focused on the need for multi-variable models to facilitate policy research. Dror (1981:98) comments,

> The enumeration, classification and elaboration of policy instruments constitute another very important subject for policy sciences. . .to arrive at as exhaustive lists as possible of the different variables which can be used as policy instruments, and to study their domains of applicability. . . .

Berman (1978:159) suggests, "The faint lines of a framework [of implementation studies] may be emerging . . . ." Berman (1978:180) concludes that

> . . .implementation analysis could make a major contribution to more effective policy by developing institutionally grounded heuristics to help policy-makers adapt their decisions as implementation problems arise.

O'Toole (1986:183-184) examined more that 300 policy studies covering almost all major fields of policy and noted, "Researchers do not agree on the outlines of a theory nor even on the variables crucial to implementation success." While O'Toole (1986:189) disparages the lack of convergence in the field of policy research, he admits the possibility of building such convergence and suggests several proposals for doing so. In addressing his proposals, O'Toole (1986:203-204) states,

> The review of the empirical literature suggests some implicit agreement on several clusters of variables deserving of further intensive investigation. Efforts should be undertaken to build systematic and cumulatively on the research that has focused on policy characteristics, resources, implementation structure, implementator disposition, implementor-client relationships, and timing. Several efforts in the implementation literature stand out as promising and worthy of more careful testing and development. Some [including the Van Meter and Van Horn model] sketch interesting models or rudimentary theories of the implementation process.

The present study, based on the Van Horn and Van Meter (1977) model, is intended to provide information to both policymakers and policy implementors regarding the process of teacher evaluation policy implementation.

Potential Contributions to Practice

Policies, Rubin (1984:8-9) notes,

> . . .normally outline a plan of action. . .[and] can be used to identify specific goals. . .to establish mandates, to provide guidelines. . .to outline a problem-solving strategy. . .to sanction behavior. . . or to achieve consistency.

Teacher evaluation policy in Alberta has all of the elements Rubin mentions. According to the Department of Education's MFP Manual, teacher evaluation policy outcomes are intended to have a positive impact on the quality of teaching. And yet, poorly implemented teacher evaluation policy can conceivably have the opposite effect. Popham (1986:56) believes ". . .the implementation of large-scale teacher evaluation systems may, in the long term, have an adverse effect on the quality of education." An implementation study is needed to provide timely process information to allow any necessary adjustments to occur.

Teacher evaluation policy development and implementation in Alberta is a local jurisdictional responsibility, but local policies must meet provincial guidelines, especially with respect to the due process criterion.

Each Regional Office of the Alberta Department of Education was responsible for receiving policies for school systems in its zone, but not all policy elements could be assessed from an *a priori* review of policy documents. Many items, such as, "How well is the process communicated", "What resources or personnel are available to assist", and "What is the importance of teacher and supervisor commitment to follow up on the findings of ongoing evaluation" need to be assessed during implementation of the policy. Consequently, a comprehensive evaluation of the policy implementation process, conducted in the field in a randomly selected sample of school districts is needed. Smith (1973:208) suggests,

> . . .the idealized policy's function and relationships can be itemized and then compared with the actual outcomes of the implementation process. It is possible that in some instances the patterns of the idealized policy have never materialized or that the outcome of the change process has been to crystallize patterns of resistance to the idealized policy's program and goals.

Coleman and LaRocque (1983:245) argue that to be policy relevant, policy research should be

> . . .concerned with causality, with the complexity of the problem and the setting in which it exists, and with the utility, that is, the possibility of policy-makers acting on the findings and recommendations.

Other authors, including Dror (1971), Dunn (1981), Mazmanian and Sabatier (1981), Gove, Whit and Walker (1985), Seidman (1983), Mosher (1977), Scheirer and Rezmovic (1983), Scriven (1979), Smith (1973), Newcombe and Conrad (1981), Borich (1983), Edwards and Sharkansky (1978), and Van Meter and Van Horn (1977) support the need for policy implementation studies as a means of improving social programs.

Definitions

Implementation study - a process evaluation which provides information on policy implementation to policy makers and program personnel in order to allow adjustments to the implementation process prior to conducting a product or impact evaluation.

Teacher evaluation - all policies and procedures directed to assessing the performance or competence of teaching personnel in elementary and secondary schools.

Management and Finance Plan - a comprehensive program policy document prepared by the Alberta Department of Education to define policies and guidelines for financial and program initiatives of the Department of Education.

Policy impact - changes in behavior or attitudes that result from policy initiatives (Dunn, 1981:280).

Post-audit - refers to the process of holding school jurisdictions accountable for the results of educational expenditures within the context of the Management and Finance Plan of the Alberta Department of Education.

Delimitations

This study was delimited to the province of Alberta, Canada. Further, the study was delimited to ascertaining the state of teacher evaluation policy implementation in 1986-87, through interviews with policy makers, administrators, and teachers in Alberta school jurisdictions, and analysis of jurisdiction-based policy documents and instruments used in evaluating teachers.

Limitations and Assumptions

The following limitations and assumptions apply to this study:

The potential for interviewees to experience perceptual error and inaccuracy in describing teacher evaluation policy processes may limit the accuracy of the research.

The Alberta Department of Education required school districts to have policy on teacher evaluation in place by June, 1985; it was therefore assumed that the sampled jurisdictions have begun implementation of teacher evaluation policy and that policy implementation has proceeded to a stage at which this study is warranted.

Since only 90 policy implementors at 30 of 146 school jurisdiction sites were interviewed limitations due to sampling error are possible.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of Related Literature

Introduction

This literature review examines theoretical organizational processes having implications for teacher evaluation policy implementation, the general societal context of teacher evaluation in Alberta and recent studies of teacher evaluation processes.

Organizational Theory and Teacher Evaluation

The theoretical processes which Mintzberg (1979) and Meyer and Rowan (1978) discuss provide useful perspectives for assessing the political and bureaucratic aspects of teacher evaluation policy. Specifically, Mintzberg presents a conceptualization of the teaching profession which explains the capacity of the profession to resist change imposed exogenously, such as demands from a department of education for teacher evaluation. Meyer and Rowan introduce the concept of the "Logic of Confidence" which, similar to Mintzberg's conceptualization, also explains how the teaching profession can successfully resist change.

The teaching profession can be described as a professional bureaucracy (Mintzberg, 1979). Professional bureaucracies are characterized by autonomy which Mintzberg (1979:371) suggests "allows the professionals to perfect their skills, free of interference." This suggestion assumes that the professional accepts responsibility for self-directed skill development and that the aura of the professional bureaucracy is not eroded. An inherent weakness of the professional bureaucracy lies in its self-reliance for professional ethics. The crucial components of democracy and autonomy represent, according to Mintzberg (1979:372), ". . .all the major problems of the Professional Bureaucracy." When there are few or no external controls on the work from outside the profession, there is also "no way to correct deficiencies that the professionals themselves choose to overlook." Professional discretion is a double edged sword which ". . .allows professionals to ignore needs of clients and the organization." (Mintzberg, 1979:374).

When the public and government perceive client needs as not being adequately served, Mintzberg (1979:376) suggests that problems are seen

> . . .as resulting from a lack of external control of the professional, and his profession. So they do the obvious: try to control the work with one of the coordinating mechanisms. Specifically, they try to use direct supervision, standardization of work processes, or . . .of outputs.

Mintzberg (1979:377-378) argues that the nature of the professional bureaucracy makes attempts at external controls difficult. He argues that complex work cannot be effectively performed unless it is under the control of the professional who performs it, and that "technocratic controls" lessen professional conscientiousness with the result that innovation can suffer.

Rather than forcing external control on the professional bureaucracy Mintzberg (1979:379) argues that other strategies might be more effective. Specifically, he states,

> . . .change seeps in by the slow process of changing the professionals - changing who can enter the profession, what they learn. . .and thereafter how willing they are to upgrade their skills.

Mintzberg's conceptualization of the professional bureaucracy is an effective framework for describing the internal structures of the teaching profession and the interactions the profession establishes with its environment. The imperatives for teacher evaluation interact with the characteristics of freedom and autonomy which are inherent in the professional bureaucracy. Freedom and autonomy are necessary to carry out the work of the professional, but paradoxically, at the same time they create the space for error and abuse of responsibility to occur. Furthermore, the unique relationship between professional teacher and student do not submit well to standardization, thus making external evaluation a difficult process to establish with validity and reliability.

The technical difficulties of creating effective teacher evaluation processes within a professional bureaucracy are also addressed by Strike and Millman (1983:397). They comment,

> But the central issues of designing an effective and functional system of evaluation concern how to embed technically respectable methods of evaluation into a complex social and institutional environment.

Strike and Millman (1983:390-393) suggest several questions relative to a research agenda on teacher evaluation. For example, research might address whether differences in the legal rights of tenured and non-tenured teachers are sufficient reasons for different evaluation practices between these two groups. In addition, what constraints do political considerations place on the technical aspects of teacher evaluation? Are teacher evaluation practices congruent with teacher views and teacher roles? And, what administrative structures are required relative to: administrative support, teacher involvement, an expertise base, and a generally recognized need for change in the teacher evaluation process?

Authority in the professional bureaucracy is based on the power of expertise. Trust is placed in the professionals by clients, partially because of this perceived expertise, but organizational structures can also provide a basis for trust in professionals. Meyer and Rowan (1978:81) note that there is low control over the internal instructional activities in educational organizations because of the loosely coupled structure of schools. However, certain formal structures such as certification of teachers, allocation of funds, curriculum design, etc., are tightly organized. These tightly controlled formal structures are defined as "ritual classifications" by Meyer and Rowan (1978:95) which provide order for schools and provide an additional basis for trust in the professionals. Meyer and Rowan (1978:100) note that the ritual classification structures are decoupled from the internal instructional activities of the school and that this

> . . . decoupling protects the ritual classification scheme . . .measuring what teachers are actually teaching introduces unnecessary uncertainty. . .and creates doubts about the effectiveness of . . .the categorical rules that define appropriate education.

Meyer and Rowan (1978:101-102) suggest that this decoupling is a mechanism for maintaining support for the organization in a pluralistic environment and the "Logic of Confidence" created is a process for maintaining the legitimacy or trust placed in the organization itself. They conclude that

> The most visible aspect of the logic of confidence in the educational system is the myth of teacher professionalism [which] . . .helps to justify the confidence placed in teachers (Meyer and Rowan, 1978:102).

Meyer and Rowan (1978) link the mythical aspects of professionalism to the logic of confidence which results from the decoupling of the formal, ritualistic classifications of the organization from the internal instructional operations of the school. This decoupling allows teacher professionals to operate in relative isolation from potentially critical environments. Mintzberg (1979), as discussed above, views professionalism as also based in bureaucratic structures such as standardization and decentralization, but links professionalism directly to the complex nature of the professional technologies.

These two views are complementary. The logic of confidence placed in educational organizations helps to explain how professional bureaucracies can buffer themselves from their environments. Likewise, demands for external teacher evaluation policies and accountability can be explained as an erosion of the logic of confidence. Teacher evaluation policies create changes to the ritual classification structures of the school; the internal processes are more closely coupled to the formal structures and the buffering capacity of the organization is lessened. Demands to couple formal, ritualistic classifications with the internal processes of schools result when the professionals fail to maintain their credibility, perhaps as a result of being buffered too completely, for too long. Teacher evaluation, mandated by governments is a logical consequence of such dynamics.

Societal Contexts of Teacher Evaluation

A rapidly changing social environment over the last two decades has created potent forces which have resulted in demands for policies addressing evaluation of school systems.

Iannaccone (1977:282) argues that professionalism has "removed education from an arena with conflicting value systems and placed it in the realm of science." Assuming the development of disparate value bases between teacher professionals and external groups, the ultimate result of professionalism controlling the educational agenda may be an unavoidable conflict with groups in the external environment. The inevitable powerlessness external groups experience when professionals inside the organization control too many of the processes of education may create a power struggle. Iannaconne (1977:277) suggests that "a fundamental source of tension...arises over the issue of the relative power of professionals and lay citizens over educational decisions."

Educators and school boards may have been short-sighted in creating an aura of professionalism around schools and in not opening schools sufficiently to public input. Lutz (1977:59) cautions that "...in exercising power we must not only be aware of the immediate power outcomes but also of the effects that the patterning of power has on the future of the political system itself." Also, Mann (1977:91) warns that school boards are too insulated from their publics and that they essentially fail to represent the publics or to control schools with the result that the "task of representing the wishes and welfare of the public fall to the professional educators . . .[who] stress. . . professional autonomy, often at the expense of the communities' expressed preferences." Iannaconne (1977:271) discusses this phenomenon and argues that "privatization", or professionalism in this case, detaches the governing process from the political order or the environment. He suggests that no system can afford to be isolated when the environment is experiencing change. The costs of isolation can include reduced resources and lowered credibility.

Iannacone (1980:194) notes that the political environment in which educational organizations operate has changed in the past ten years. Consequently, the power relationship between the environment and educational organizations is undergoing change currently. Previously, there was an atmosphere of greater trust in educational professionals. Policies mandating teacher evaluation demonstrate this trust deficit as well as the political dynamics of educational policy formulation. Iannacone (1980:207) states that, "policy flow is not simply hierarchical but represents the outcome of complex interactions among interdependent but separate structures of power and authority."

Goodlad (cited in Housego and Downey,1984:1) in his Blueprint for Reform argues that

> The province should set the expectations, the mandate for schools. It should then empower districts and schools to meet the expectations, and hold them accountable for doing so.

In other words, provincial governments determine the ends and local jurisdictions determine the means. This prescription has some similarity to the Management and Finance Plan (MFP) and the related evaluation policies of Alberta Education.

Iannacone (1980:205) suggests that policies (such as the MFP) are the result of interactions between sub-structures with divergent interests. He states that,

> . . .two aspects are critical. . .in any interpretation of legislative policy impact. One is the degree of independence found in local school districts, and the other is a split within the local districts between the school board/central office level and the principal/teacher/student level of decision making.

This observation has interesting implications for the resource dependency model of educational organizations (Weeres, 1984:9) which specifies that organizational autonomy is linked to the degree of resource independence the organization enjoys, and for March's 1980 doctoral dissertation on the locus of control over decision making between departments of education, central office level and school level decision making. March (1981:209) found a trend toward centralization in Alberta, but coupled with increased control at the school level. He also observed that centralizing influences tended to be associated with factors external to educational organizations; such as, the political and economic climate, whereas decentralizing factors tended to be related to internal school operational matters.

Paulston (cited in Papagiannis, 1982:246) provides further elaboration of the political nature of educational change; he notes that, "Ideology, power, and perceived group self-interest . . .[are] key factors influencing planning and implementation of basic educational reforms."

Certainly, deeply rooted, basic and extensive imperatives for change have affected education in the past two decades. Iannacone (1980:192) suggests that, "Research in the politics of education was largely stimulated by the increasing political controversies about education since the late 1950's." Iannacone (1980:204) cites declining student achievement scores and the observation that, ". . . policy makers began to recognize that the gap between policy making and implementing it was widening", as two key factors which destablized educational politics. He further suggests that the schools,

> . . . are in an era of pervasive and increasing political controversies. . .including their mission, structure of governance, instructional delivery systems and fundamental ideology (Iannacone, 1980:194).

A changing educational environment holds implications for teacher evaluation. Societal change has been popularized by Naisbitt (1984) who focused attention on societal shifts from an industrial to an information society characterized by a global economy, decentralization and networking. Ingram (1985:4-7) considers specific societal pressures for change in Alberta and notes increased diversity in school jurisdictions and school programming, concerns for justice, tolerance and excellence, accountability and involvement as potential social forces in the province. Ingram (1985:10-12) observes that educational management has already been involved in one paradigm shift, from scientific management to a more humanistic model. Ingram (1985-19-23) suggests that recent review initiatives by the Department of Education and the introduction of the Management and Finance Plan (MFP) are evidence of a "potential" new paradigm shift in educational management, but questions whether value bases have actually shifted sufficiently in Alberta to support a true paradigm shift.

Recent Studies of Teacher Evaluation

Duncan's (1984) study of teacher evaluation practices in Alberta indicated that respondents believed evaluation was a high priority, but felt that little time was available to carry it out. The majority of evaluations were done routinely to improve instruction, or to provide data to make decisions regarding permanent contracts or certification. However, a startling finding was that only 4.5% met the minimum criteria for due process and only 1.3% met criteria for improvement of instruction. A follow-up study by Alberta Education (1985:1) concluded that ". . .formal evaluation practices by principals in Alberta did not change from 1983-84 to 1984-85."

Townsend (1984) investigated implementation of teacher evaluation policies and practices in five Lethbridge, Alberta secondary schools involving 107 teachers and 16 administrators. Townsend (1984:20) noted that the time demand of supervision for administrators greatly exceeded expectations, which negatively affected implementation. Other inadequacies Townsend (1984:24-31) noted in his study include:

-teacher rejection of evaluations done for administrative purposes;

-decline of teacher confidence in skills of evaluators;

-information to teachers regarding process was lacking;

-teacher training regarding evaluation purposes and process was insufficient;

-administrative leadership with respect to evaluation was weak;

-time demands were not met adequately;

-district office support was felt to be inadequate; and,

-divergent models of teacher evaluation were not considered.

Mireau (1986:13), author of a set of teacher evaluation inservice materials sponsored by the Alberta Department of Education, comments

> The most frequent excuses for providing only a minimal amount of teaching supervision - or for

> avoiding the task altogether - include lack of time and the risk of destroying good rapport with teachers. I think, however, that the basic reason is that we have a great deal to learn about recognizing and promoting effective teaching practices and about conferencing strategies which can pave the way to open, supportive, and practical feedback to teachers.

These authors and their studies suggest that the state of teacher evaluation in Alberta may not be in a position to support comprehensive implementation of the policy initiatives of Alberta Education at the present time. Given a potential lack of evaluative expertise in the field, questions about the viability of a value based paradigm shift, and questions about the adequacy of model development and infrastructure preparation, teacher evaluation policy implementation in Alberta may experience barriers to successful implementation.

Hickcox (1982:1) cites Scriven's description of teacher evaluation as a "disaster" and makes the point that ". . . sound research on the topic, particularly on. . . implementing. . .has not had a high priority in the universities." Hickcox (1982:6) provides four recommendations with respect to teacher evaluation process:
1) evaluation procedures should be cooperatively developed; 2) evaluation should be considered a continous process; 3) teachers should know in advance the steps to be followed, the appeal process and the judgement criteria; and 4) policies and procedures should be under continous review.

Hickcox (1982:12) advances the Connecticut approach to teacher evaluation, which has some similarity to the Alberta approach, as a sound process. He states,

> It is mandated that every school system in the state develop an evaluation system. While there are broad parameters, there is considerable flexibility. . .the system is monitored by an independent board consisting of representatives from various constituencies . . .the state provides funds to assist in the development of plans to provide in-service training. . .it was recognized that any real change will not occur without nurturing, training experiences and support. . .through cooperation between the state, the universities, and the teachers, the evaluation system itself is systematically evaluated. . .nothing is written in stone.

Duckett (1985:v) argues that it is apparent that many administrators are not comfortable in their new roles as systematic evaluators of teaching and that little in their academic background prepared them for rigorous, empirical evaluation of teachers.

Manatt (1985:11-12) suggests the competent evaluator must know: 1) self, 2) elements of effective instruction, 3) clinical supervision, 4) how to develop a "use-tailored" teacher evaluation system, 5) how to infer, 6) conference techniques, 7) due process, 8) how to work with the marginal teacher, and 9) what teachers want from performance evaluation. Manatt (1985:13) further comments

> One presumes that principals, department heads, and supervisors would be well-acquainted with the research on teaching and techniques of clinical supervision. In the U.S. such is not the case generally. . . .Canada, incidentally is generally ahead of the United States in this regard.

Manatt (1985:18-30) identifies a number of factors for successful teacher evaluation which can be linked to teacher evaluation policy implementation variables, including: attitudes or dispositons of implementors toward evaluation, posturing by top executives as a motivator for principals, extensive inservicing, the power of sponsorship and modeling, participative planning without haste, rigorous training during the adoption year, clear communications to teachers regarding what is expected of them, and multiple classroom visits to every teacher every year. Manatt (1985:33) concludes,

> The foot draggers will say 'Yes-but-it takes too much time!' . . .Ineffective schools take too much time, 13 years for your children and mine. Ineffective teachers cost too much. A 23 year-old teacher granted tenure despite his or her low quality teaching will cost a school well over a million dollars before he or she retires. Good performance appraisal doesn't cost, it Pays.

Wise, et al (1985) conducted a comprehensive survey of teacher evaluation practices in 32 United States school districts and completed intensive case studies in four districts selected for their success in teacher evaluation implementation. Wise, et al (1985:63) discovered that generally, ". . .relatively few school districts have highly developed teacher evaluation systems and even fewer put the results into action."

A critical perspective based in the Wise, et al (1985) study is that the teacher evaluation policy selected for a school district must be finely tuned to that district's needs, purposes and context. Wise, et al (1985:65-66) propose four perspectives or theoretical frameworks for analyzing teacher evaluation: 1) teaching as 'labor' assumes effective teaching practices can be concretely determined and specified; 2) teaching as 'craft' assumes general rules for applying specific techniques; 3) teaching as 'profession' assumes standards of professional knowledge and practice are enforced to assure competent teaching; and 4) teaching as 'art' assumes intuitive, creative, improvisational teaching. Wise, et al (1985:93) suggest that these four perspectives may be thought of as a continuum, with each perspective requiring unique evaluation policies. Wise, et al (1985:66) contend that the teacher as artist perspective requires that the teacher exercise considerable autonomy in the performance of their work, a perspective closely resembling Mintzberg's conception of the professional bureaucracy, and that contextual variables increase in importance as one moves from teaching as labor to teaching as art.

Wise, et al (1985:78) noted that the case study results from the four districts which had experienced successful teacher evaluation implementation suggested four critical implementation factors:

1) top-level leadership and institutional resources for the evaluation process,
2) evaluator expertise,
3) administrator-teacher collaboration to develop a common understanding of teacher evaluation goals and purposes, and
4) compatability with district overall goals and organizational context.

These four factors may be universally necessary conditions for successful implementation of teacher evaluation policy, and they warrant further analysis within the context of the present study.

Summary

A teacher evaluation policy implementation study can provide a timely and effective analysis of the implementation process. As evidenced in the above literature review, the translation of teacher evaluation policy intents to policy effects is neither direct nor simple. The process is based in political, bureaucratic and technical processes. Specific bureaucratic and technical structures may need to be in place before teacher evaluation policy can be successfully implemented.

CHAPTER THREE

Research Design and Methodology

Introduction

The research design and methodology, interview procedures, validity concerns and sampling procedures are discussed in Chapter Three.

Research Design and Methodology

This study is a descriptive survey or "case survey" (Dunn, 1981:297) which involves procedures to identify and analyze factors that account for variations in the implementation of policies. This method requires the researcher to first develop a case coding scheme of categories that capture key components of policy inputs, processes, outputs or impacts.

The information required for the study was secured through interviews and documents analysis. The first phase of the study is primarily qualitative, using semi-structured interviews of selected key decision makers and leaders in teacher evaluation in Alberta. Snowball sampling with key leaders and decision makers was used to identify a sample of these key individuals. That is, the first person interviewed, a former Minister of Education for Alberta, was asked to recommend others (Bogdan and Biklen, 1982:66).

Interview transcripts from phase I were typed and returned to interviewees who were asked to review the transcript for any errors or misinterpretations. Coding procedures recommended by Bogdan and Biklen (1982:158) guided the structure and analysis of the interview protocols.

Questions which guided phase I interviews with key policy makers included the following:

1. What process or chronology of events was important in affecting the adoption of teacher evaluation policy by the Department of Education?

2. What process or chronology of events was important in affecting the implementation of teacher evaluation policy by the Department of Education?

3. What key events may have affected the adoption of the current teacher evaluation activities in Alberta?

4. What key events may have affected the implementation process in Alberta?

5. What strategies, tactics, methods, or techniques were important for the adoption of teacher evaluation policy in Alberta?

6. Were any social structures or informal networks significant in affecting the initiation, adoption or implementation process?

7. Can you suggest any specific teacher evaluation policy materials to study, for example, documents, key correspondence, memos, studies, etc.

8. What idealized policy, relationships, and goals would you hope for to enhance teacher evaluation policy implementation?

9. What are your perceptions of the current status of teacher evaluation policy implementation?

10. Who else might be a key decision maker, policy analyst or advisor that affected the teacher evaluation adoption or implementation process?

11. How do you define the intents of teacher evaluation policy, including your world view (values) with respect to teacher evaluation?

A primary purpose of this phase was to identify the historical background, the purposes and intents of teacher evaluation policy visualized in the policy planning stage, and to determine the educational leaders' perceptions of the degree of implementation of teacher evaluation policy in the province of Alberta.

Phase II Interview Schedules and Variable Clusters

Three interview schedules were constructed to solicit responses from teachers, principals and superintendents or their designates regarding their perceptions of teacher evaluation policy implementation. Interview schedules (reproduced in Appendices A through C) were determined by findings from phase I interviews with policy makers and by the variable clusters identified by Van Horn and Van Meter (1977).

Validity Concerns

All phase I interview respondents were asked to review typed copies of the interview transcript and to correct any errors of interpretation which might have been committed by the researcher.

Initial drafts of the phase II interview schedules were reviewed by two doctoral students and three professors in the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Alberta for face validity. The second draft versions of the interview schedules were then subjected to pilot testing in the field through simulated interviews with two assistant superintendents, two principals and two teachers. This pilot testing was intended to eliminate any terms which were vague or ambiguous, and to elicit respondents perceptions of the degree of comprehensiveness represented by the interview schedules relative to teacher evaluation policy implementation. Final adjustments were made to the interview schedules based on the pilot interviews and these revised interview schedules were used in conducting phase II interviews. The interview schedules are presented in Appendices A through C.

Phase II interviewees were assured of anonymity and were not asked to review interview transcripts. During the phase II interviews if any confusion or ambiguity seemed to be present in relation to any of the responses given during the interview, the researcher confirmed the interviewee's intentions at the interview itself.

The field-based structured interviews permitted the researcher to experience more in-depth analysis of teacher evaluation policy implementation with practitioners in the field than would have been possible through survey research methodology.

Phase II interpretation involved a qualitative analysis of the interviews with policy implementors in the field to identify themes and patterns of responses in relationship to the Van Horn and Van Meter (1977) policy implementation model.

Sampling Procedure

Thirty of 146 active Alberta school jurisdictions were randomly selected from the Alberta School Jurisdiction List, 1986 for inclusion in this study. In order to assure a representative sample of jurisdictions, the population of jurisdictions was stratified on the basis of type of jurisdiction (county, public school districts, separate school districts, regional school districts or Department of National Defense schools, and school divisions) and geographic zone (1 through 6). Jurisdictions were then selected from each stratified grouping using a random numbers table.

Letters requesting each jurisdiction's participation in the study were posted on September 5, 1986. A copy of this correspondence is presented in Appendix D. Five of the thirty jurisdictions initially contacted declined involvement in the study on the basis of over-involvement with research studies or simply being too busy to participate. Alternative jurisdictions randomly selected within the same stratified grouping were subsequently contacted and all agreed to participate. The ninety phase II interviews began on October 28, 1986 and were completed on February 23, 1987.

The breakdown, by zone and type, of the jurisdictions which participated in the study appears in Table 1.

Table 1

Distribution of Participating Jurisdictions by Zone and Type of Jurisdiction

Zone	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six
Type						
Large urban	0	0	2	0	2	0
County	1	1	1	1	1	1
Public	1	1	1	1	1	1
Division	1	1	1	1	1	1
Separate	1	1	2	2	0	1
Regional	0	1	0	0	0	0

School district teacher evaluation policy documents, obtained from each sampled jurisdiction, were studied using a content analysis procedure. In addition, school administrators interviewed were asked for copies of teacher evaluation instruments (recording/reporting forms) in use in their jurisdiction. A content analysis of these instruments was completed and is reported in Chapter Eight.

Summary

The research design and methodology, interview procedures, validity concerns and sampling procedures were delineated in Chapter Three. The study was described as primarily a qualitative study intended to explore themes and trends relative to teacher evaluation policy implementation in Alberta.

Interview structures and procedures used in phase I interviews with policy makers and phase II interviews with policy implementors were defined and discussed. Actions taken to address concerns regarding validity were presented and the snowball sampling procedures used to select phase I respondents and the stratified random sampling procedures used to select phase II respondents were detailed.

CHAPTER FOUR

Conditions Affecting Policy Adoption and Implementation

Introduction

Chapter four consists of the analysis of phase I interview results with the policy makers who were influential in the adoption and implementation of teacher evaluation policy in Alberta. A central purpose of this chapter is to establish the policy intents and the background to teacher evaluation policy development in Alberta. The following questions and sub-questions are addressed in Chapter Four.

1. What events affected teacher evaluation policy adoption and implementation in Alberta?
    a. What were the policy intents held by the policy makers?
    b. What social structures or informal networks affected the policy process?
    c. What were the anticipated ideal policy intents of the policy makers?
    d. What were the perceptions of policy makers of the current status and possible future outcomes of teacher evaluation policy?

Interview Targets and Structure

The background to the teacher evaluation policy initative in Alberta was explored through interviews with key policy makers, including Mr. David King, the former Minister of Education whose term of office encompassed the development of current teacher evaluation policy. In addition, Mr. King was asked to identify individuals who had had an influence on him or who played a key role in the development of teacher evaluation policy by the Alberta Department of Education. These individuals and their position at the time of interview included: Dr. E. Hawkesworth, former Deputy Minister of Education in Alberta; Dr. N. Hrynyk, former Associate Executive Secretary, the Alberta Teachers Association; Dr. R. Bosetti, Deputy Minister of Education, Alberta Education; Dr. J. Hrabi, Assistant Deputy Minister, Planning and Evaluation Division, Alberta Education; Dr. S. Odynak, Assistant Deputy Minister, Program Delivery Division, Alberta Education; Dr. M. Fenske, Assistant Deputy Minister, Program Development Division, Alberta Education; and Dr. W.R. Duke, Assistant Deputy Minister, Finance Division, Alberta Education. In addition, Mr. Gary Zatko, Associate Director, Planning Services, Alberta Education was subsequently identified as a key policy resource person who was included in the interviews with policy makers.

The interviews, conducted during the period June 20 to September 10, 1986, were structured according to analytical categories suggested by Bogdan and Biklen (1982:158). The analytical categories were used a priori to identify potentially important information categories.

Questions included the following categories: the respondents general definition or world view of teacher evaluation; events which affected the adoption of teacher evaluation policy development in Alberta; events which affected the implementation of teacher evaluation policy at the provincial level; social structures or informal networks which were significant relative to teacher evaluation policy adoption and implementation; the idealized teacher evaluation policy functions and goals; perceptions of the current extent of teacher evaluation policy implementation and possible future outcomes which may occur given current trends.

Events Affecting Teacher Evaluation Policy Adoption

Teacher evaluation policy adoption by senior management in the Alberta Department of Education can be characterized as an evolutionary response to a series of events over a period of approximately 16 years, dating from the introduction of locally appointed superintendents in 1971.

Respondents indicated a high degree of concensus regarding several factors which affected the adoption of teacher evaluation policy by the Alberta Department of Education, including:

1) the Teaching Professions Act negotiations breakdown;
2) the general absense of routine teacher

evaluation under locally appointed superintendents;

3) the perceived need for improvement in the quality of instruction and diffuse environmental demands for accountability;
4) specific concerns regarding the need for teacher evaluation by the Premier and caucus;
5) the opportunity of linking teacher evaluation to a policy driven, post-audit program thrust by the Department of Education;
6) the logical connection between policy implementation of student evaluation and the need for concommitant teacher evaluation policy;
7) lack of action on teacher evaluation by the Alberta Teachers' Association or local jurisdictions; and,
8) concensus among senior management in the Department of Education regarding the policy directions necessary in response to the above.

These eight factors are explicated further. One respondents contention that the former Minister of Education did not understand the Alberta Teachers' Association (ATA) suggests the Teaching Professions Act (TPA) negotiations may have been effected by a poor relationship between the Minister and the ATA. When negotiations on the TPA between Alberta Education and the Alberta Teachers' Association became blocked, the Minister of

Education stated that it was necessary to proceed unilaterally with the development of the Council on Alberta Teaching Standards (COATS). These developments negatively affected the development of teacher evaluation policy through reduced trust between the Alberta Teachers' Association and the Minister, and by extension, the Department of Education.

The long term perception of senior management within the Department of Education that teacher evaluation was not occurring adequately under locally appointed superintendents was confirmed through both independent study and Department surveys (Reikie, 1977) and (Duncan, 1984).

Documentation of the Department of Education's early concerns regarding teacher evaluation can be found in a January 30, 1980 letter from Dr. E. Hawkesworth, former Deputy Minister, to Alberta school system superintendents. In the letter, Hawkesworth summarized the outcomes of a Canadian Education Association seminar on inservice and retraining of teachers and administrators which included representatives from educational sectors across Canada. In the letter, which is reproduced in Appendix E, Hawkesworth commented,

> . . .a major barrier to providing adequate professional development programs for teachers and administrators is the lack of comprehensive ongoing evaluation programs for them. . . .
> If the situation as outlined pertains in Alberta school systems also, then improvement in personnel management procedures is essential.

This concern over teacher evaluation procedures addressed in early 1980, when linked with the common experiences of senior management staff as former Department appointed school inspectors or superintendents, appears to have been a particularly important factor which facilitated adoption of teacher evaluation policy by the Department of Education.

Environmental pressure on the Department was consistently described as diffuse, but related to concerns over the need for accountability and improvement of instruction. In a subsequent telephone interview with Mr. King on January 5, 1987, the former Minister of Education was asked specifically about the nature of environmental or political pressures for teacher evaluation which he felt as minister. He responded,

> The political pressure, to the extent I felt it, came from fellow MLA's, from the media, and the general public. Most was not direct on [the] point of teacher evaluation, most was rather in [the] form of expressed frustration about something that had gone wrong with a specific teacher at the center of it; the Keegstra incident, for example. Teacher evaluation wasn't a direct request; more a questioning and frustration process. [It was] more a matter of us concluding that teacher evaluation was a potential solution to the problem.

Environmental pressures were also translated through formal provincial political channels. Both Deputy Ministers interviewed noted the influence of the Premier, and the former Minister stated that "Teacher evaluation was one of the specifics that represented a high level of interest in the caucus and with the premier" (D. King, personal communication, January 5, 1987). Essentially then, the environmental pressures from the grass roots level was general or diffuse, but was translated through the caucus and the premier as a more pointed and specific demand for formal teacher evaluation policy.

Complementary to pressures on the Department for teacher evaluation policy was an internal thrust within the Department for a policy driven, post-audit management and finance plan which would structure and guide the programs of the Department of Education. Consequently, evaluation policies, whose initiative preceeded the Management and Finance Plan (MFP) ultimately became an integral component of the MFP. Both were meant to be outcomes-oriented with an emphasis on ends-versus-means with Alberta Education's primary role in articulating ends which were drawn out by the political process operating within the provincial community.

The logical connection between student evaluation policy and teacher evaluation policy is underscored by the political connections. Tymko (1979:287) investigated the accreditation of Alberta high schools issue and noted,

> The Premier of Alberta addressed the Canadian Education Association and indicated the problem of quality in education will result (in Alberta at least) in strong public demand for some form of province-wide testing.

The concerns which Mr. King noted that were held by the caucus and the premier regarding teacher evaluation were apparently intimately linked to perceptions of need for student evaluation. This linkage is reflected in the importance given these two policy thrusts by the Alberta Department of Education.

One respondent noted the lack of a proactive stance with respect to teacher evaluation by the Alberta Teachers' Association and local jurisdictions. This perpsective coincides with the point of view of senior management within the Department of Education regarding relative inaction by school jurisdictions. Essentially, in the absense of any action in the field and with distinct pressures for teacher evaluation, the Department had no option but to act as the policy catalyst with respect to teacher evaluation policy adoption.

Lastly, teacher evaluation policy adoption was facilitated by the shared perspectives and experiences of senior management as Department appointed school inspectors or superintendents, and resultant consensus regarding adoption of teacher evaluation policy among these senior policy makers in the Department of Education.

Events Affecting Teacher Evaluation Policy Implementation

Teacher evaluation policy implementation was strongly affected by a specific environmental event, the Keegstra affair, and by the internal development of the Management and Finance Plan of the Alberta Department of Education. Jim Keegstra was an Alberta Social Studies teacher who was dismissed in January, 1983 for teaching unauthorized curriculum based on Jewish conspiracy theory (David, 1983:21). The dismissal and subsequent de-certification of Mr. Keegstra generated intensive media scrutiny over a period of many months.

Most interviewees perceived the Keegstra affair as a catalyst to implementation of teacher evaluation policy in terms of limiting the potential resistance of the Alberta Teachers' Association, and in keeping public awareness of the issue high. However, it is interesting to note that the former Minister of Education commented on the potential negative effect of the Keegstra affair with respect to its limiting opportunity for teacher input into the policy development process at the local jurisdictional level.

The Keegstra affair represents a classic example of how an extraneous, environmental event can dramatically affect the policy implementation process.

The Management and Finance Plan of the Alberta Department of Education represents an important teacher evaluation policy implementation vehicle. The high visibility of the MFP, and the commitment to it by senior management in the Department, coupled with the requirement of teacher evaluation policy implementation by local jurisdictions as a pre-requisite for funding, resulted in the interviewees perceiving it as a powerful implementation instrument.

Other factors which were seen by the policy makers as affecting the implementation process included:

1) the Alberta Teachers' Association position on formative and summative evaluation as a barrier to implementation;
2) the Department's requirement of teacher evaluation policy approval which served as a potential source of misunderstanding;
3) the under-supply of staff skilled in teacher evaluation;
4) the effect of role shifts from consulting to monitoring in the Regional Offices of Education;
5) the support of the Alberta School Trustees' Association and the Council of Alberta School

Superintendents;

6) the difficulty of the appeal process in small jurisdictions;
7) the visible and practical support of the Mireau inservice materials; and,
8) the former Minister of Education's interest in evaluation in educational systems.

These points are elaborated further. The Alberta Teachers' Association was perceived by most interviewees as a barrier to implementation in terms of its insistence that formative and summative functions of evaluation must be separate, and in terms of its general organizational role.

Teacher evaluation policy was the only evaluation policy that had to be approved by the Department of Education. While this policy standard was meant to facilitate the implementation process, it apparently in some cases caused some misunderstanding regarding the role of the Department in the policy development process, or resistance to the requirement by policy implementors.

Concerns regarding the undersupply of skilled evaluative staff, role shifts from consultation to evaluation by the Regional Offices, and problems with appeal processes in small jurisdictions were mentioned by only one or two interviewees, but provide useful points of comparison with the characteristics of the implementing agency, communications, and resources variables of the Van Horn and Van Meter (1977) policy implementation model.

Likewise, ASTA and CASS support for teacher evaluation policy, the Mireau teacher evaluation inservice materials developed by the Department of Education in support of teacher evaluation initiatives, and Mr. King's ongoing interest in evaluation were mentioned by one interviewee, but these themes are relevant to the policy implementation model used in the study.

Policy Intents of Teacher Evaluation

King, the former Minister of Education, identified teacher evaluation as an early priority of his portfolio. He viewed teacher evaluation as encompassing both self-evaluation and external-evaluation components, with both types focusing on improvement of teacher performance.

Among senior management in the Department of Education, there existed a high degree of concensus regarding the intents of teacher evaluation policy. All respondents within the Department concurred with the focus on improvement of instruction, while many saw it as a mechanism to improve teacher professionalism. One Assistant Deputy Minister saw it as a means of demonstrating accountability to the public. The perspectives of the senior management within the Alberta Department of Education was congruent with the former Minister of Education's views.

Social Structures or Informal Networks

Informal networks or their absense appear to have played an important role in the development of teacher evaluation policy in

Alberta. Specifically, informal contacts with the Alberta School Trustees' Association (ASTA) provided for better communications between the Department of Education and that body. The absence of informal communication mechanisms between the Department and the Alberta Teachers' Association (ATA) may have exacerbated the tensions between the ATA and Department with respect to teacher evaluation policy development.

Idealized Policy Intents

Ideally, under conditions of successful implementation, Mr. King indicated that he viewed teacher evaluation as accomplishing four goals: 1) elimination of incompetent teaching, 2) improvement of the act of teaching, 3) improvement of the overall quality of teaching, and 4) contributing to increased public confidence in the educational system.

Interviews with policy makers indicated that ideal policy intents and requirements needed to enhance implementation of teacher evaluation policy would include:

1) more effective personnel resources;
2) better liaison with the Alberta Teachers' Association and universities regarding support structures;
3) institutionalization of teacher evaluation with evaluation seen as a need versus a threat;
4) increased resources, especially in small jurisdictions;

5) more research and development on teacher evaluation processes; and,

6) a clear focus on the improvement of teaching and resultant student learning.

Current Status and Possible Future Outcomes

Teacher evaluation policies were in place locally in 1985. The former Minister of Education stated that he did not know the implementation situation currently, but as of last year some boards were doing well and others badly. Teacher evaluation cannot be successful in the long term, Mr. King stated, unless teachers are committed to the value of it and are involved in designing and operating the process. This scenario would likely develop through an evolutionary process.

Ultimately, teacher evaluation policy will be sucessfully implemented, Mr. King suggested, for four reasons. First, the process has passed from politicians to the grass roots level. Consequently, the level of conflict will be reduced and cooperative, successful local models will evolve and be emulated. Second, younger professionals entering teaching will bring new ideas regarding the value and role of management and evaluation in education. Third, teacher evaluation is necessary for the health of the profession. Fourth, the public now expects teacher evaluation as an aspect of the educational system, and both the government and the teaching profession have a stake in the successful implementation of teacher evaluation policy in order to improve and maintain the public's confidence in education.

The policy makers interviewed did not believe teacher evaluation policy initiatives will dissipate; however, they also did not think that implementation is anywhere near complete.

The future will likely require the creation of mechanisms that will provide for more teacher involvement in the evolution of teacher evaluation processes in Alberta. In addition, the expertise base and resources in support of teacher evaluation will need enhancement. Court cases questionning the expertise of evaluators and collective agreement negotiations focusing on teacher evaluation procedures might also be future forces shaping teacher evaluation in the province.

Summary and Conclusions

Phase I interview results with the policy makers who were influential in the adoption and implementation of teacher evaluation policy in Alberta were presented in Chapter Four. A central purpose of this chapter has been to establish the policy intents and the background to teacher evaluation policy development in Alberta.

The following questions and sub-questions were addressed in Chapter Four.

1. What events affected teacher evaluation policy adoption and implementation in Alberta?

a. What were the policy intents held by the policy makers?

b. What social structures or informal networks affected the policy process?

c. What were the anticipated ideal policy intents of the policy makers?

d. What were the perceptions of policy makers of the current status and possible future outcomes of teacher evaluation policy?

Among senior management in the Department of Education, there existed a high degree of concensus regarding the intents of teacher evaluation policy.

Teacher evaluation policy adoption in Alberta was based on a complex interplay of forces dating back to the early 1970's. Policy makers indicated a high degree of concensus regarding several factors which affected the adoption of teacher evaluation policy by the Alberta Department of Education, including:

1) the breakdown in the Teaching Professions Act negotiations between the Department of Education and the Alberta Teachers' Association;
2) the general absense of routine teacher evaluation under locally appointed superintendents;
3) diffuse environmental demands for accountability related to concerns over the need for improvement of instruction;
4) specific concerns regarding the need for

teacher evaluation by the provincial premier and the caucus of the Provincial Legislature;

5) the opportunity of linking teacher evaluation to a policy driven, comprehensive monitoring initiative by the Department of Education;
6) the logical connection between policy implementation of student and teacher evaluation as accountability mechanisms;
7) insufficient action on teacher evaluation by the Alberta Teachers' Association and by local school jurisdictions; and,
8) concensus among senior management personnel in the Department of Education regarding the policy directions necessary for teacher evaluation policy adoption.

Teacher Evaluation policy implementation is perceived to have been strongly affected by the Keegstra affair by policy makers who saw the incident acting as a catalyst to policy implementation. Also, the advent of the Department of Education's Management and Finance Plan served as a timely and effective implementation vehicle in support of teacher evaluation policy. Other factors which were seen as affecting the implementation process included:

1) the Alberta Teachers' Association position on formative and summative evaluation as a barrier to implementation;
2) the requirement that each local jurisdiction's

teacher evaluation policy be approved by the Alberta Department of Education as a potential source of misunderstanding;

3) the under-supply of staff skilled in teacher evaluation;
4) the effect of role shifts from consulting to monitoring in the Regional Offices of Education;
5) the support of the Alberta School Trustees' Association and the Council of Alberta School Superintendents;
6) the difficulty of the appeal process in small jurisdictions;
7) the visible and practical support of the Mireau inservice materials; and,
8) the former Minister of Education's interest in evaluation in educational systems.

Informal networks or their absense appear to have played an important role in the development of teacher evaluation policy in Alberta. Specifically, informal contacts with the Alberta School Trustees' Association provided for better communications between the Department of Education and that body. The absence of informal communication mechanisms between the Department and the Alberta Teachers' Association may have exacerbated the tensions between the ATA and Department with respect to teacher evaluation policy development.

Ideal policy intents and requirements needed to enhance implemenation of teacher evaluation policy included:

1) more effective personnel resources;
2) better liaison with the Alberta Teachers' Association and universities regarding support structures;
3) institutionalization of teacher evaluation with evaluation seen as a need versus a threat;
4) increased resources, especially in small jurisdictions;
5) more research and development on teacher evaluation processes; and,
6) a clear focus on the improvement of teaching and resultant student learning.

Policy makers did not believe teacher evaluation policy initiatives will dissipate; however, they also did not think that implementation is anywhere near complete.

CHAPTER FIVE

Policy Intents, Standards and Resources

Introduction

Phase II interview results with teacher evaluation policy implementors are presented in Chapter Five. The research problems addressed in this chapter include:

What were the perceived policy intents held by policy implementors and were perceptions of intents between policy makers and implementors congruent?

To what degree have policy standards and resources affected teacher evaluation policy implementation (Van Horn and Van Meter, 1977)?

Also addressed in Chapter Five are the general impressions of policy implementors.

Policy Intents at the Provincial Level

Two questions were asked of teachers, principals and superintendents regarding the intents of teacher evaluation policy:

1. What do you believe are the purposes of the teacher evaluation policy at the provincial level; and,

2. What, in your opinion, are the purposes of your jurisdiction's teacher evaluation policy?

Interviews with policy makers revealed that among senior management in the Department of Education, there existed a high degree of concensus regarding the intents of teacher evaluation. All respondents within the Department concurred with the focus on improvement of instruction, while many saw it as a mechanism to improve teacher professionalism. One Assistant Deputy Minister saw it as a means of demonstrating accountability to the public.

Teacher evaluation policy adoption by senior management in the Alberta Department of Education was largely an evolutionary response to a series of events over a period of approximately 16 years, dating from the introduction of locally appointed superintendents in 1971.

Policy makers indicated a high degree of concensus regarding several factors which facilitated the adoption of teacher evaluation policy by the Alberta Department of Education, including:

1) the Teaching Professions Act negotiations breakdown;
2) the general absense of routine teacher evaluation under locally appointed superintendents;
3) the perceived need for improvement in the quality of instruction and diffuse environmental demands for accountability;
4) specific concerns regarding the need for

teacher evaluation by the Premier and caucus;

5) the opportunity of linking teacher evaluation to a policy driven, post-audit program thrust by the Department of Education;
6) the logical connection between policy implementation of student evaluation and the need for concommitant teacher evaluation policy;
7) lack of action on teacher evaluation by the Alberta Teachers' Association or local jurisdictions; and,
8) concensus among senior management in the Department of Education regarding the policy directions necessary in response to the above.

Relative to the question regarding policy intents at the provincial level, the content analysis of phase II interviewee responses identified eleven response categories, which are summarized in Table 2.

Each interviewee may have indicated more than one response; therefore, total responses exceed the number of interviewees.

Table 2

Phase II Respondent Identified Provincial Level Policy Intents

Response	Tchrs.	Prins.	Supts.	Total
Demonstrate accountability to the public	11	15	19	45
Improve teaching methods	8	13	12	33
Response to Keegstra	9	8	4	21
Political reaction by the DOE	6	10	5	21
Assure uniformity of evaluation standards	5	5	7	17
Monitor and improve teacher proficiency	5	4	5	14
Assure curricular standards	8	3	1	12
Response to absence of evaluation	4	0	0	4
Back-up permanent certification process	2	0	0	2
Enhance professional status of teaching	1	0	0	1
Improve classroom discipline	1	0	0	1

note: Tchrs.=Teachers, Prins.=Principals, Supt.=Superintendents.

The most common response for teachers, principals and superintendents was demonstration of accountability to the public. Although this intent was identified by policy makers as a reason for policy adoption, they did not identify it as a primary policy intent, nor is it identified as such in the provincial policy manual. Half of the policy implementors, however, perceive accountability as the primary purpose or intent of teacher evaluation policy at the provincial level.

The second most frequent response overall was improvement of teaching methods, with principals and superintendents citing this purpose more often than teachers. This purpose is highly congruent with both the responses of policy makers in Phase I interviews and with provincial policy documents (Alberta Education, 1984b).

The third and fourth most frequent responses are both highly political in nature. Response to the Keegstra affair and political reaction by the Department of Education were both cited by 21 of the 90 respondents. The reference to Keegstra might be considered a specific example of a political response. Policy makers identifed grass roots political pressure as diffuse, but distinct political pressure was felt from the provincial legislature. Political pressure was seen by policy makers as a factor affecting adoption of policy, but is not a stated intent of provincial policy. The Keegstra affair was identified by policy makers as a key factor in the implementation of teacher evaluation policy in Alberta, but clearly was not an issue in the policy adoption stage. However, 21 respondents, including 9 teachers perceive the Keegstra affair as a factor affecting the purposes or intents of provincial teacher evaluation policy. This misperception of provincial policy intents by policy implementors might result in misunderstanding and resistance to teacher evaluation policy by implementors.

The next three response categories "assure uniformity of evaluation standards, monitor and improve teacher proficiency, and assure curricular standards" were mentioned by 17, 14 and 12 of the 90 respondents respectively. These three response categories are largely congruent with provincial policy intents or factors affecting adoption of policy as defined by policy makers.

The last four response categories "response to absense of evaluation, back-up permanent certification process, enhance professional status of teaching, and improve classroom discipline" were mentioned infrequently, and hence are not major factors from the perspective of policy implementors. It is significant, however, that the response category, "enhance the professional status of teaching", which is a stated objective of provincial policy (Alberta Education, 1984b), was mentioned by only one respondent, a teacher. The lack of recognition of this policy intent by policy implementors suggests the need for more adequate communication and support of this intent by policy makers.

Policy Intents at the Jurisdictional Level

All three phase II respondent levels, teachers, principals, and superintendents, were asked for their opinion of the purposes of their jurisdictions' teacher evaluation policy. Responses to this question are summarized in Table 3. Each interviewee may have indicated more than one response; therefore, total responses exceed the number of interviewees.

Table 3

Phase II Respondent Identified Jurisdictional Level Policy Intents

Response	Tchrs.	Prins.	Supts.	Total
Improve teacher performance; Improve educational quality	21	24	29	74
Board concern regarding accountability	10	4	10	24
Personnel decision making	1	9	13	23
Compliance with Department requirements	6	6	2	14
Recognize or reward dedicated teachers	1	4	6	11
Maintain curricular standards	4	2	2	8
Assure teacher evaluation standards; consistency	0	2	0	2
Assure evaluation occurs	1	0	0	1
Response to the Keegstra affair	1	0	0	1
Assess inservice needs	0	1	0	1
Enhance professional status of teaching	0	0	1	1
Assist in the planning process	0	0	1	1

Note: Tchrs.=Teachers, Prins.=Principals, Supt.=Superintendents.

By far, the most frequent purpose of teacher evaluation policy identified at the jurisdictional level was improvement of teacher performance or educational quality, with 74 of 90 respondents noting this intent. This compares to 33 respondents who cited the same intent at the provincial level. A significant translation of policy intent from the provincial to the jurisdiction level appears to have occurred in the perception of policy implementors. The translated jurisdictional policy intent is consistent with stated provincial policy, but does point out a lack of congruence with perceived policy intent at the provincial level.

Board concern over accountability was noted by 24 respondents and was the second most frequent response which compares to the accountability concern being first relative to the perception of provincial policy intents. However, it is noteworthy that only one respondent perceived the board's teacher evaluation policy to be a response to the Keegstra affair, whereas 21 respondents made this connection regarding provincial policy intents.

Personnel decision making was seen as an important intent of jurisdictional teacher evaluation policy, primarily by administrative staff with only one of the 23 respondents who identified this intent being a teacher.

An additional imbalance between teacher and administrative respondents is apparent with respect to the purpose of recognizing or rewarding dedicated teachers, with ten of the eleven respondents being administrators.

The absense of a perception of teacher evaluation policy having the intent of enhancing the teaching profession, noted at the provincial policy level, was also identified as minimal at the jurisdictional level, with only one respondent again suggesting this purpose.

The consistent absence of this policy intent from the perspective of policy implementors suggests an important discrepancy between the intents of the policy makers and the perception of that intent by the policy implementors.

The remaining response categories noted in Table 3 were mentioned infrequently, and are not major factors from the perspective of policy implementors.

Policy Intents - A Summary

Overall, the policy implementors in the field perceive the purposes or intents of teacher evaluation at the provincial level largely as a demonstration of accountability or a Department of Education response to political events. One third of the respondents did perceive the intent of improving teaching; however, only one respondent identified enhancement of the teaching profession as an intent of provincial policy.

On the other hand, 74 respondents linked improvement of teaching as a policy intent at the jurisdictional level, suggesting that a translation of this policy intent between organizational levels has occurred. Essentially, implementors perceive teacher evaluation policy at the provincial level to have a summative emphasis, and at the jurisdictional level to have a formative emphasis.

The enhancement of the professional status of teaching as a policy intent was also absent at the jurisdictional level. Since ". . .professional growth and development of teachers." (Alberta Education, 1984b:72) is a stated intent of provincial teacher evaluation policy, the almost complete absence of this policy intent in the perception of policy implementors warrants careful consideration by both policy makers and policy implementors.

Policy Standards

Van Horn and Van Meter (1977:107) define policy standards as policy inputs which ". . .establish requirements, in varying degrees of specificity, for how those [policy] goals shall be implemented." In the case of the provincially initiated teacher evaluation policy, the absence of policy standards is noteworthy. Local jurisdictions were given a large degree of flexibility and were encouraged to develop their own local policies on teacher evaluation within the broad guidelines that teacher evaluation be intended to improve the quality of instruction and the professional development of teachers. Bosetti, the current Deputy Minister of Education, noted in the phase I interviews reported in Chapter Four that this arrangement provided school jurisdictions with a maximum amount of autonomy with respect to teacher evaluation practices. The one noteworthy exception to this was the requirement that teacher evaluation policies be submitted to a Regional Office of Education so the Department could assure that the local policy was adequate with respect to due process requirements.

One question was asked of principals and superintendents regarding this policy standard. Specifically, "Has the 'due process' requirement of the Alberta Department of Education caused implementation difficulties in your jurisdiction?"

All 30 of the principal respondents indicated that they had no problems with the due process requirement. One principal respondent indicated that he anticipated problems in small districts where the appeal may be directed to the evaluator, and two principal respondents indicated they were concerned with the possible paper work associated with an appeal. Not one of the principal respondents indicated they have had any direct experience with an appeal to date; therefore, the due process concept is clearly an untested area within the respondents' schools.

Twenty-six superintendent interviewees responded that they had no problems with the due process requirement. Four respondents stated they had concerns about the due process policy standard. Three of the four were concerned about the problem of appeals in small districts, where appeals would be directed to the evaluator, and one was concerned about appeals being directed to school boards.

Due process in practice is also largely untested from the superintendent's perspective, but eight superintendents reported informal appeals which were resolved through mutual agreement with the teacher, such as early retirement, before the appeal reached a formal stage.

The absence of formal appeals in the thirty jurisdictions involved in the present study suggests that this particular policy standard presents few difficulties in theory with the policy implementors. However, when tested in practice, due process policy standards may create problems, particularly in small jurisdictions, and possibly with the appeal route if school boards are demonstrated to lack requisite expertise to judge appeal proceedings.

Policy Resources

Policy resources are defined by Van Horn and Van Meter (1977:107) as the funds and incentives allocated to the policy initiative. Teacher evaluation policy was mandated in Alberta within the regular funding structures. That is, no additional monies were allocated to support the teacher evaluation policy implementation process at the jurisdictional level. Incentives were more of a resource dependency model where jurisdictions were told to implement teacher evaluation policy or face the possibility of having funding cut off (King, 1984). These incentives are addressed directly under the enforcement variable cluster discussed in Chapter Six.

Given the absence of funding structures in support of teacher evaluation policy implementation, and the desire to avoid leading questions in the interview schedules, policy resources were not addressed directly. However, the database of phase II interview responses was searched for terms which relate to policy resources. The policy resource term which occurred most often was "time". Twelve teacher respondents, fifteen principal respondents and seven superintendent respondents identified lack of time for teacher evaluation policy implementation as a factor which has weakened their support for implementation of their jurisdictions teacher evaluation policy. In addition, two teachers, 8 principals and 2 superintendent respondents identified additional time for implementation as a future resource need to assure that teacher evaluation has a positive influence in their jurisdiction.

Mireau (1986) has noted that demands for more time by administrators may be an excuse for avoiding a difficult task, but the frequency with which time as a needed resource is mentioned by respondents suggests that this resource need may be a very real factor that acts as a distinct barrier to successful implementation of teacher evaluation policy in specific situations.

General Impressions of Policy Implementors

The first question asked of each respondent in the phase II interviews was, "Would you share with me your general thoughts on teacher evaluation policy implementation in your school (or jurisdiction)?" The primary purpose of this question was to assist the respondent in focusing thought on the topic of teacher evaluation policy implementation. Respondents in the pilot phase of interview schedule development indicated the question was useful to their thought processes at the beginning of the interview. The question, in itself, does not refer to a specific variable cluster in the Van Horn, Van Meter (1977) policy implementation model, nor to policy intents, but content analysis of the question did reveal some interesting patterns from the perspective of the respondents, and are therefore reported here.

The most frequent comment, by 15 teachers, was that teacher evaluation policy was a worthwhile endeavor, indicating a significant proportion of teachers who hold a positive general orientation toward teacher evaluation policy. In total, teacher respondents made 18 positive comments about teacher evaluation policy implementation. These positive comments were counterbalanced by 17 negative concerns, such as the stressful and threatening nature of teacher evaluation, that teacher evaluation was time consuming, was implemented suddenly, or that administrative evaluators lacked requisite evaluation skills. For teacher respondents the positive and negative comments were nearly equal.

Principals tended to be slightly more positive than their teacher counterparts. Twenty-five positive comments were made by principals versus 21 negative comments. Principals were most positive with respect to teacher evaluation policy implementation resulting in fine tuned teacher evaluation policy, that it was a worthwhile endeavor, that the implementation process was positive with adequate opportunity for their input, and with the emphasis on formative evaluation. Twenty-one negative comments were made. The most common were the time consuming nature of teacher evaluation, conflict between their summative and formative roles, and unclear evaluation processes or lack of administrator evaluation skills.

Superintendents were most positive of the three phase II interview groups. Nineteen positive comments were made by superintendents regarding, for example, the fine tuning of teacher evaluation policy, the worthwhile nature of teacher evaluation, and the opportunity for input to policy formulation provided to staff. Only 13 negative comments were mentioned by superintendents; the most frequent included the sudden nature of policy implementation, and unclear evaluation processes or lack of administrator evaluation skills.

In summary, superintendents were the most positive, followed by principals and then teachers. However, even teacher respondents were more positive than negative regarding their general comments regarding teacher evaluation policy implementation in their school.

Summary and Conclusions

Phase II interview analysis presented in Chapter Five included: comparison of policy intents from the perspective of policy makers and policy implementors in the field, general impressions of policy implementors, policy standards, and policy resources.

Policy intents or purposes as defined by policy makers were shown to be more congruent with the perspectives of policy implementors at the jurisdictional level than at the provincial level. The policy intent of providing for professional growth and development of teachers is generally not perceived by policy implementors.

The policy implementors in the field perceive the purposes or intents of teacher evaluation at the provincial level largely as a demonstration of accountability or a Department of Education response to political events. One third of the respondents did perceive the intent of improving teaching; however, only one respondent identified enhancement of the teaching profession as an intent of provincial policy.

On the other hand, 74 respondents linked improvement of teaching as a policy intent at the jurisdictional level, suggesting that a translation of this policy intent between organizational levels has occurred. Essentially, implementors perceive teacher evaluation policy at the provincial level to have a summative emphasis, and at the jurisdictional level to have a formative emphasis.

The enhancement of the professional status of teaching as a policy intent was also absent at the jurisdictional level. Since ". . .professional growth and development of teachers" (Alberta Education, 1984b:72) is a stated intent of provincial teacher evaluation policy, the almost complete absence of this policy intent in the perception of policy implementors warrants careful consideration by both policy makers and policy implementors.

Due process requirements as a policy standard have not presented any difficulties for policy implementors, but this area is also largely untested with none of the thirty jurisdictions sampled reporting an appeal to the formal stage. Concerns were expressed about problems of appeal procedures in small jurisdictions.

Policy resources were not assessed through direct questions in phase II interviews, but content analysis of the interview database revealed that concerns over "time" as a resource for teacher evaluation policy implementation occurred relatively frequently.

Within the Alberta context, the variable clusters, policy standards and policy resources reflect minimal provincial involvement relative to teacher evaluation policy implementation.

General impressions of policy implementors reveal that superintendent respondents are most positive regarding teacher evaluation policy implementation, and teachers are least positive. However, teacher respondents expressed more positive than negative comments regarding their general impressions of teacher evaluation policy implementation.

CHAPTER SIX

The Effects of Five Process Variables on Teacher Evaluation Policy Implementation

Introduction

The research question considered in Chapter Six examines the degree to which communications, enforcements, characteristics of the implementing agencies, political environment, and socio-economic environment variables have affected teacher evaluation policy implementation. These five variable clusters from the Van Horn and Van Meter (1977) policy implementation model are examined in relationship to phase II interview results and in terms of their effect on teacher evaluation policy implementation in Alberta.

Communications

Communications variables are defined by Van Horn and Van Meter (1977:108-109) as the clarity with which policy standards are communicated to implementors, so they will know what is required of them, and the interpretations implementors place on the program and acceptable local performance.

Two questions were asked of teachers, principals and superintendents in phase II interviews regarding the communications variable cluster:

1. "In what way were the teachers involved in developing your jurisdiction's evaluation policy?" and,

2. "Are policy expectations from the school office (central office for principals or Alberta Education for superintendents) sufficiently clear from your point of view to define what is expected of you in the teacher evaluation implementation process?"

Responses to the first question are summarized in Table 4. In some cases, more than one mechanism for input to policy formulation was available; therefore, totals exceed the number of respondents.

Table 4

Phase II Respondent Identified Teacher Involvement in Policy Development - Communications Variable

Response	Tchrs.	Prins.	Supts.	Total
Teacher representatives on a policy committee	10	12	21	43
Via principal; discussion at staff meetings	8	11	11	30
No opportunity for input	6	9	0	15
Via direct request to each teacher to react to policy	2	4	8	14
Don't know or not sure	9	0	0	9

note: Tchrs.=Teachers, Prins.=Principals, Supts.=Superintendents.

Superintendents in every jurisdiction reported that teachers had some mechanism for input into policy formulation. However, nine principals and fifteen teachers reported either no opportunity for input or uncertainty regarding mechanisms for input into formulation of teacher evaluation policy. This discrepancy demonstrates the difficulty of communication through multiple levels of an organization and pinpoints a problem area which King referred to in the phase I interviews. That is the possibility that teachers have lacked real opportunity for input into defining what teacher evaluation policy should be. The quality of input when mechanisms for input were available is an additional concern. Several teachers commented on this factor: ". . .actual input was more on method; the need for policy was generally accepted", or "We were involved, but there was a feeling of inevitability to the process; key issues were not addressed." In addition, seven principals who observed discussion of teacher evaluation either on committees or at staff meetings commented on the minimal dialogue among teachers that occurred, given the importance of the topic for teachers. Lastly, the comments of one superintendent are significant, ". . .feedback was minimal, [teacher evaluation policy] seemed to be generally accepted. . . .I sometimes wonder to what degree teachers were actually involved."

Recall that King's concern was that the Keegstra affair, while facilitating policy implementation on the one hand by eliminating resistance to teacher evaluation policy implementation, on the other hand may have done harm in limiting opportunities for teacher input into policy formulation at the local level. Teacher responses to the question about opportunity for input, where 50% of the respondents indicated no opportunity and several respondents who had opportunity but characterized it as a fait accompli, seem to lend credibility to King's concern.

The second question addressed the adequacy of communication regarding the interviewees understanding of policy and their responsibilities relative to their position as a teacher, principal or superintendent. Responses to the second communications question are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5

Phase II Respondent Identified Policy Expectations - Communications Variable

Response	Tchrs.	Prins.	Supts.	Total
Yes, policy and expectations clearly understood	20	25	25	70
No, policy vague or not clarified	10	5	5	20

note: Tchrs.=Teachers, Prins.=Principals, Supts.=Superintendents.

Communications regarding role responsibilities relative to teacher evaluation are clearer for administrators than for teacher respondents. This finding is not surprising in view of the fact that teachers felt they had less opportunity for input into policy formulation than did the administrator respondents. Some clarification of policy, particlularly for teachers, but also for principals and superintendents in several jurisdictions is needed.

On a more positive note, six of the superintendent respondents noted the usefulness of the Regional Offices of Education in policy development and clarification of teacher evaluation policy implementation.

Enforcements

Van Horn and Van Meter (1977:110) suggest that enforcements are of three types: norms, incentives, and sanctions, which correspond to Etizoni's distinction between normative, remunerative and coercive forms of power.

The enforcements variable cluster was addressed with one question to teachers, principals and superintendents, an additional question to principals and superintendents, and two more questions to superintendents only.

The enforcement question addressed to all three respondent levels was: "What means have been used in your school (or jurisdiction) to encourage teachers to cooperate with the teacher evaluation policy?"

Responses to this question are summarized in Table 6. No interviewee suggested that enforcements of a remunerative-incentive type were occurring. An interesting discrepancy appears from the perspective of teachers versus administrators. Thirteen teachers perceived a must do or coercive-sanction enforcement pattern, while only three principals and five superintendents held this view. On the other hand, 13 teacher respondents perceived a normative-formative emphasis or a normative-formative emphasis linked with a must do approach, whereas 26 principal respondents and 13 superintendent respondents held this point of view. Clearly, administrator respondents view the enforcements used to induce teacher cooperation with teacher evaluation policy as a more normative process than do the teacher respondents.

Table 6

Phase II Respondent Identified Means Used to Encourage Teacher Cooperation with Teacher Evaluation Policy - Enforcements Variable

Response	Tchrs.	Prins.	Supts.	Total
Both must do policy with a formative emphasis	11	18	12	41
A must do emphasis/ DOE policy requirement	13	3	5	21
Learning process/ formative emphasis	2	8	1	11
Little effort to clarify policy	4	1	3	8
Provided for teacher input to policy process	0	0	8	8
By example, with emphasis on fairness	0	0	1	1

note: Tchrs.=Teachers, Prins.=Principals, Supts.=Superintendents.

Two teachers commented that teacher evaluation policy was viewed by tenured teachers as a non-issue primarily affecting the non-tenured staff. Thirteen teacher respondents commented on the stress producing, negative aspect of teacher evaluation, and thirteen teacher respondents made positive comments regarding the teacher evaluation process.

The second enforcements question, addressed to principals and superintendents was: "What means have been used in your jurisdiction to encourage principals to implement the teacher evaluation policy?"

Responses to this question are summarized in Table 7.

Table 7

Phase II Respondent Identified Means Used to Encourage Principal Cooperation with Teacher Evaluation Policy ~ Enforcements Variable

Response	Prins.	Supts.	Total
Both a policy directive and linked to a normative approach	12	25	37
Policy directive	8	4	12
Collegial approach with normative emphasis	9	1	10
Nothing, supt. does all teacher evaluations	1	0	1

note: Prins.=Principals, Supts.=Superintendents.

More congruence between the perspectives of principals and superintendents regarding enforcements used to encourage principal cooperation with teacher evaluation policy exists, than between respondent groups for enforcements for teacher cooperation.

Twenty-one principal respondents and twenty-six superintendent respondents perceived either a normative emphasis or a normative emphasis linked with a policy directive or sanction approach.

The emphasis on improvement of instruction given to jurisdictional level policy intents is apparent in the prepondance of normative-collegial enforcement strategies reported by administrators.

The third and fourth enforcement questions were asked only of superintendents. They were: "The Alberta Department of Education has used 'must do' statements to ensure that school jurisdictions implement teacher evaluation policy. What has been your reaction to the appropriateness of these means used to ensure compliance with provincial mandates to implement teacher evaluation policy?" and, "Would you recommend other means to ensure compliance with provincial policy?"

Seventeen superintendent respondents indicated a positive reaction to provincial enforcement strategies. Three of the seventeen suggested sanctions were necessary because earlier attempts at volunteer implementation had not worked.

Ten superintendents responded with mixed reactions. Of the ten, one suggested the provincial approach put teachers in a defensive position; two stated they did not think the Department of Education had sold the need for teacher evaluation sufficiently; three argued the Department should not treat all jurisdictions equally as the Management and Finance Plan does; and one noted that resources are too limited.

Three superintendent respondents stated they had a negative reaction to provincial enforcement strategies. Reasons for their negative reaction included: their jurisdiction had already been doing teacher evaluation and sanctions were not necessary; that teacher evaluation is not an area for the Department to be involved in; or the implementation model is too top down.

The last enforcements question asked superintendent respondents if they would recommend other means to assure compliance with provincial teacher evaluation policy.

Twelve respondents said no. Five suggested a need for regular monitoring of policy implementation by provincial authorities. Four argued for more consultation and support mechanisms. Two suggested a need for more sensitivity to local differences. Four stated a need for wider input into the policy adoption process, such as more representation by the Alberta Teachers' Association and the Alberta School Trustees' Association. Two noted a need for the Department of Education to demonstrate need for teacher evaluation more effectively. Lastly, one stated a need to revise policy to a more goals/results orientation away from the current process orientation.

In summary, administrator respondents view the enforcements used to induce teacher cooperation with teacher evaluation policy as a more positive process than do the teacher respondents. However, the emphasis on improvement of instruction given to jurisdictional level policy intents is apparent in the prepondance of normative enforcement strategies reported by administrators at the local level of implementation.

Twenty-seven superintendent respondents reacted either favorably or with mixed support for provincial enforcement strategies. However, eighteen superintendent respondents made suggestions regarding how provincial enforcements might be adjusted which indicates a need to review enforcement strategies by provincial officials.

Characteristics of the Implementing Agency

Van Horn and Van Meter (1977:114) define the characteristics of the implementing agency variable cluster as, ". . .the experience and competence of the staff to perform the tasks required of them."

Five questions were formulated to address this variable cluster. The first question was asked of superintendent respondents only and was, "Who has responsibility for evaluating teachers in your jurisdiction?" Three questions addressed the issue of whether the teachers, principals and central office supervisory personnel have had training specifically in teacher evaluation, and what training has been most useful. A fifth question asked, "To what degree are you satisfied with your jurisdiction's methods used to measure teacher performance?"

Eighteen superintendent respondents reported that responsibility for teacher evaluation was shared between principals and central office staff. Of these eighteen, eleven identified principal responsibility for primarily formative evaluation and central office staff for summative evaluations; four indicated teacher evaluation was a shared activity without any clear role differentiation between administrative levels; one respondent stated principals were responsible for non-tenured staff and central office personnel for tenured staff evaluations, and two repondents noted the converse (i.e., principals responsible for tenured teachers and central office for non-tenured teachers).

Twelve superintendent respondents identified principals as primarily responsible for all teacher evaluation, with central office personnel providing only a backup role when needed.

All three respondent levels were asked what training had been provided to teachers to facilitate their understanding and cooperation with teacher evaluation policy implementation in their jurisdiction.

The results of this question are reported in Table 8.

Table 8

Phase II Respondent Identified Training Provided to Teachers - Characteristics of the Implementing Agency Variable

Response	Tchrs.	Prins.	Supts.	Total
No training	15	13	11	39
Orientation to jurisdiction evaluation	9	7	12	28
Professional development workshops	7	12	5	24
Policy development meetings	1	3	2	6
University courses	1	0	0	1

note: Tchrs.=Teachers, Prins.=Principals, Supts.=Superintendents.

Many jurisdictions have not addressed the question of teacher training in support of teacher evaluation policy implementation. One-half of the teacher respondents could not identify any training or inservice activities specifically on teacher evaluation. Orientations to jurisdictional evaluation procedures were most frequently cited as a means of preparing teachers for their roles in teacher evaluation processes. Professional development activities were reported by 24 respondents who often reported that training had not been presented on teacher evaluation specifically, but on effective teaching strategies which was formally or informally linked to teacher evaluation criteria.

Discrepancies between respondent levels is likely due to variation in exposure to training activities that had been provided. It is significant that few jurisdictions have given a priority to teacher inservice on teacher evaluation specifically. Several administrator respondents commented that the professional development concern/priorities have passed on to other things.

Only principal and superintendent respondents were asked about training specifically on teacher evaluation provided for principals. Responses to this question are summarized in Table 9. Many respondents indicated more than one training opportunity; therefore, total responses exceed the number of respondents.

Table 9

Phase II Respondent Identified Training Provided to Principals - Characteristics of the Implementing Agency Variable

Response	Prins.	Supts.	Total
Seminars, conferences, and workshops	29	23	52
University courses	15	8	23
Mireau inservice materials	2	9	11
On the job experience	6	1	7
Readings	1	0	1

note: Prins.=Principals, Supts.=Superintendents.

All administrator respondents identified at least one training opportunity specifically on teacher evaluation. Workshops, conferences and seminars on teacher evaluation were rated as most useful by eight principals, and university courses, primarily on clinical supervision were rated most useful by seven principals. Effective teaching programs were frequently mentioned as highly effective and desirable as a focus for further inservice linked to teacher evaluation training.

It is clear that principals have had opportunity to experience some inservice training in support of their teacher evaluation responsibilities.

In response to a sub-question regarding what additional training would be most helpful, twelve administrator respondents suggested teacher effectiveness training; eight expressed the need for more practical experience; six for university teacher supervision courses; eight for collegial supervision models or trust building/helpful evaluation strategies; and two for a review of research and evaluation instruments.

Superintendent respondents were asked what specific teacher evaluation training central office supervisory personnel had experienced. Most respondents indicated more than one type of training; therefore, the number of responses exceed the number of respondents. The response category and frequency of responses are summarized below:

workshops, seminars, and conferences	23
university courses	18
Mireau inservice materials	10
on the job experience	3
Teacher Perceiver materials	2
other	3
no training	1

Six superintendent respondents suggested workshops, seminars and conferences had been most useful to them. University courses, on the job experience and the Mireau inservice materials were identified by two respondents respectively as most useful to them. Ten superintendent respondents mentioned effective teaching inservice as useful especially in a workshop format. Richard Manatt's work on teacher evaluation was often identified as useful.

In response to the sub-question, regarding what additional training would be useful, 14 respondents stated no need for more inservice on teacher evaluation, or were unsure of specific needs. Five suggested need for more workshops, seminars or conferences. Four noted collegial-trust building or help strategies inservice sessions are needed. Two expressed need for effective teaching inservice, two asked for contact with other practioners and for practical evaluation models, one stated a desire for evaluation of evaluators, and one respondent wanted inservice on report writing skills.

Superintendent respondents, like their principal counterparts, have had opportunity to experience some inservice training in support of their evaluation activities. Half of the superintendent respondents identified a need for additional inservice training.

The last question which addressed the characteristics of the implementing agency variable cluster asked if teacher, principal and superintendent respondents were satisfied with the jurisdictions' methods used to measure teacher performance. Responses to this question are summarized in Table 10

Table 10

Phase II Respondent Identified Satisfaction with Methods Used to Measure Teacher Performance - Characteristics of the Implementing Agency Variable

Response	Tchrs.	Prins.	Supts.	Total
Evaluation criteria and anecdotal format is good	15	11	12	37
Format and criteria is acceptable	7	7	13	27
Format and criteria is vague/poor	5	8	3	18
Need more time in evaluation process	2	4	0	6
Format flexibility is good	0	2	3	5
Clinical supervision model is good	1	0	2	3
Need standardized form to assure fairness	2	0	0	2
Need description of teaching context included	1	0	0	1
More objectivity is needed	0	1	0	1

note: Tchrs.=Teachers, Prins.=Principals, Supts.=Superintendents.

The strongest single theme to emerge from analysis of this question was the preference expressed by many respondents for anecdotal evaluation reporting formats.

Overall 64 respondents expressed high or moderate levels of satisfaction with methods used to evaluate teacher performance. Eighteen respondents indicated dissatisfaction with evaluation format and criteria. This dissatisfaction was linked by some respondents to such factors as a lack of a standardized form to assure fairness, the need for a description of the teaching context in the evaluation report, and the need for more objectivity.

Much divergent opinion was observed in response to this question. What was seen as a strength in a method by one respondent, for example the flexibility of anecdotal reporting formats, was seen as a weakness by another respondent. This observation lends support to Darling, Hammond and Wise's (1985) argument for custom designing teacher evaluation method to the specific needs of a jurisdiction at a given point in time.

In summary, in twelve jurisdictions principals are primarily responsible for all teacher evaluation, with central office personnel providing only a backup role when needed. In the other 18 jurisdictions sampled teacher evaluation is a shared responsibility between principal and superintendent.

Few jurisdictions have given a priority to teacher inservice on teacher evaluation specifically. Several administrator respondents commented that the professional development concern/priorities have passed on to other things.

It is clear that principals and superintendents have had opportunity to experience some inservice training in support of their teacher evaluation responsibilities.

The strongest single theme to emerge from analysis of the question about satisfaction with evaluation methods in use was the preference expressed by many respondents for anecdotal evaluation reporting formats.

Overall 64 of 90 respondents expressed high or moderate levels of satisfaction with methods used to evaluate teacher performance; however, divergence of opinion regarding evaluation methodology supports the wisdom of designing evaluation methodology to fit local evaluation intents and expectations.

Political Environments

The political environment is defined by Van Horn and Van Meter (1977:114) as "The extent of support for or oppostion to the policy objective. . . ."

Two questions were asked of principal and superintendent respondents to assess the political environment in their communities. They were:

"How has implementation been affected by the jurisidiction's political climate? For example, was teacher evaluation an issue in the October 20, 1986 board elections?" and,

"Have you tried to make parents or parent groups aware that a new teacher evaluation policy is being implemented in your school (jurisdiction)? How effective has this been?"

Responses to the first question, summarized in Table 11, demonstrate that teacher evaluation has been remarkably absent as a political issue in local communities from the perspective of both principals and superintendents.

Table 11

Phase II Respondent Identified Jurisdictional Political Effect on Policy Implementation - Political Environment Variable

Response	Prins.	Supts.	Total
No effect; not perceived as an issue	22	24	46
A minor issue	8	6	14

note: Prins.=Principals, Supts.=Superintendents.

In those jurisdictions where teacher evaluation was seen as a local issue, it was perceived to be of a minor nature usually based on community dissatisfaction with an individual teacher. Significantly, no respondent indicated that teacher evaluation had been a major issue in their jurisdiction.

Political pressure for teacher evaluation does not appear to have been a grass roots phenomenon that was manifested through local political channels, such as school board elections.

The second political environment question asked to what extent school prinicpals or superintendents had attempted to keep parents or parent groups informed about teacher evaluation policy implementation. If teacher evaluation was a key political issue at the local level, it was anticipated that school jurisdictions would have been active in communicating progress regarding teacher evaluation policy implementation to their publics. The response categories to this question are summarized in Table 12.

Table 12

Phase II Respondent Identified Jurisdictional Attempts to Inform Parents about Teacher Evaluation Policy Implementation - Political Environment Variable

Response	Prins.	Supts.	Total
No attempts	17	5	22
Minimal attempts	7	15	22
Multiple, proactive attempts to inform parents	6	10	16

note: Prins.=Principals, Supts.=Superintendents.

Forty-four respondents indicated either no or minimal attempts at informing parents or their publics regarding teacher evaluation policy implementation in their jurisdictions. Minimal attempts were interpreted as passive communications, usually in annual reports or through regular media coverage of board meetings. Proactive attempts were interpreted as specific forums held to inform the public, letters mailed directly to parents, specific press releases intended to focus media attention on teacher evaluation policy implementation, or some combination of specific attempts at communicating to the public. One-third of the sampled jurisdictions had used proactive mechanisms to inform their community. Superintendents were more aware of this process than were principal respondents, but generally had a casual perception of how effective communication efforts had been at informing parents.

In summary, political support for teacher evaluation does not appear to have been a grass roots phenomenon that was manifested through local political channels. The majority of school jurisdictions sampled have taken no action or minimal action to communicate to their publics about teacher evaluation policy implementation and thus engender greater community support for continued implementation of this policy initiative.

Socio-Economic Environments

Van Horn and Van Meter (1977:114) indicate that social and economic variables refer to environmental conditions affecting the policy implementation process. For example, the type of community economic resources can affect the kinds of services rendered and their relative importance, Van Horn and Van Meter (1977:115) suggest.

This variable cluster was the most elusive to tap given the specific policy being studied and the context of implementation. None of the pilot questions in the phase II interviews survived the interview schedule development process to assess the socio-economic variable cluster directly. In addition, the background literature review did not identify local socio-economic factors as being important to the implementation of teacher evaluation policy. Essentially, factors which were identified as important seemed to be adequately covered by the other seven variable clusters of the Van Horn and Van Meter

(1977) policy implementation model relative to the particular application of the model in the current study.

Summary and Conclusion

Five variable clusters from the Van Horn and Van Meter (1977) policy implementation model, Communications, Enforcements, Characteristics of the Implementing Agency, Political Environments and Socio-Economic Environments were examined in Chapter Seven in relationship to phase II interviews and in terms of their effect on teacher evaluation policy implementation in Alberta.

Teachers felt they had less opportunity for input into policy formulation than did the administrator respondents. Some clarification of policy, particlularly for teachers, but also for principals and superintendents in several jurisdictions is needed.

Administrator respondents view the enforcements used to induce teacher cooperation with teacher evaluation policy as a more normative process than do the teacher respondents. However, the emphasis on improvement of instruction given to jurisdictional level policy intents is apparent in the preponderance of normative enforcement strategies reported by administrators at the local level of implementation.

Twenty-seven superintendent respondents reacted either favorably or with mixed support for provincial enforcement strategies. However, eighteen superintendent respondents made suggestions regarding how provincial enforcements might be adjusted which indicates a need to review enforcement strategies by provincial officials. Five suggested a need for regular monitoring of policy implementation by provincial authorities. Four argued for more consultation and support mechanisms. Two suggested a need for more sensitivity to local differences. Four stated a need for wider input into the policy adoption process, two noted a need for the Department of Education to demonstrate need for teacher evaluation more effectively, and one stated a need to revise policy to a more goals/results orientation away from the current process orientation.

It is significant that few jurisdictions have given a priority to teacher inservice on teacher evaluation specifically. Several administrator respondents commented that the professional development concern/priorities have passed on to other things. It is clear that principals have had opportunity to experience some inservice training in support of their teacher evaluation responsibilities. Superintendent respondents, like their principal counterparts, have had opportunity to experience some inservice training in support of their evaluation activities. Half of the superintendent respondents identified a need for additional inservice training.

In 12 jurisdictions principals are primarily responsible for all teacher evaluation, with central office personnel providing only a backup role when needed. In the other 18 jurisdictions sampled teacher evaluation is a shared responsibility between principal and superintendent.

The strongest single theme to emerge from analysis of the question about satisfaction with evaluation methods in use was the preference expressed by many respondents for anecdotal evaluation reporting formats.

Overall 64 of 90 respondents expressed high or moderate levels of satisfaction with methods used to evaluate teacher performance, however, divergence of opinion regarding evaluation methodology supports the wisdom of designing evaluation methodology to fit local evaluation intents and expectations.

In those jurisdictions where teacher evaluation was seen as a local issue, it was perceived to be of a minor nature usually based on community dissatisfaction with an individual teacher. Significantly, no respondent indicated that teacher evaluation had been a major political issue in their jurisdiction.

Political support for teacher evaluation does not appear to have been a grass roots phenomenon that was manifested through local political channels. The majority of school jurisdictions sampled have taken no action or minimal action to communicate to their publics about teacher evaluation policy implementation and thus engender greater community support for continued implementation of this policy initiative.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Disposition of the Implementors, Policy Effects, and Anticipated Future Needs

Introduction

Research questions and sub-questions addressed in Chapter Seven include:

To what degree has the disposition of implementors affected policy implementation?

What were the percevied policy effects held by policy implementors?

Were perceptions of effects between policy makers and implementors congruent?

How similar were the expectations of policy makers and implementors for full implementation of teacher evaluation policy?

What future adjustments to teacher evaluation policy implementation were perceived to be needed by policy makers and policy implementors?

Disposition of the Implementors

Disposition of the implementors refers to elements of the implementors' response to policy which may affect their ability or willingness to implement, for example, their understanding of policy standards, the direction of their response to them, and the intensity of their response (Van Horn and Van Meter, 1977:113).

Four questions were asked in the phase II interviews that relate to the disposition of the implementors variable cluster. The first three questions were asked of all respondent levels (i.e., teachers, principals and superintendents), but were reworded for each respondent level to be applicable to that level. The fourth question was asked only of superintendents.

The first question asked teachers if anything had weakened their support for implementation of the jurisdiction's teacher evaluation policy, and asked principals and superintendents if any aspects of the policy had resulted in resistance by teachers. The responses to this question set are summarized in Table 13.

Some discrepancy is apparent between the perspectives of teachers versus administrators. Administrative respondents tended to be less aware of sources of teacher resistance; however, it is notable that more than one third of the teacher respondents stated that nothing had weakened their suppport for implementation of teacher evaluation policy.

The most frequent source of resistance perceived by teachers, but largely missed by administrators, was subjective, insufficient or invalid bases of teacher evaluation. Other sources of resistance identified by all three respondent groups included the role of the principal relative to formative versus

Table 13

Phase II Respondent Identified Sources of Teacher Resistance to Implementation of Teacher Evaluation Policy - Disposition of the Implementors Variable

Response	Tchrs.	Prins.	Supts.	Total
No resistance	12	19	19	50
Empirical base too subjective; insufficient or invalid data	8	1	1	10
Principal should do only formative evaluation	3	1	4	8
Stress; anxiety and exhaustion of evaluating	1	4	2	7
Some staff evaluated too often; others too seldom	1	0	3	4
Lack of central office involvement/support	1	2	0	3
Lack of training/ skills of evaluators	1	1	0	2
Repeated postponement of scheduled visits	1	1	0	2
Lack of time spent in evaluation process	1	0	0	1
Use of evaluation to terminate teachers unpopular in the community	1	0	0	1
Confusion re: teaching effectiveness criteria linked to evaluation	0	1	0	1
Need for expertise in subject area by evaluator	0	0	1	1

note: Tchrs.=Teachers, Prins.=Principals, Supts.=Superintendents.

summative evaluation; the stress, anxiety and exhaustion associated with evaluation; and the unequal application of teacher evaluation across staffs.

Interestingly, administrative respondents identified the stress/anxiety factor more often than the one teacher respondent who noted this phenomenon. Other sources of resistance were noted by only one or two respondents, but the responses do identify potential sources of resistance by teachers and are therefore worthy of note by policy implementors as a potential problem area in a particular jurisdictional setting.

One teacher respondent stated "I support the concept [of teacher evaluation] in abstract, but dread it in practice" which seemed an apt description of the paradox of evaluation which teachers experience.

These findings suggest the existence of a substantial base of support for teacher evaluation policy by members of the teaching profession, but also the presence of a number of concerns, which if not addressed, could result in increasing resistance by teachers to implementation of teacher evaluation policy in Alberta.

The second question in the disposition of the implementors variable cluster asked teachers if any aspects of teacher evaluation policy had caused implementation difficulties for the school administrative staff, and asked principals and superintendents if anything had weakened their support for implementation of their jurisdictions teacher evaluation policy. Responses to this question are summarized in Table 14.

Table 14

Phase II Respondent Identified Sources of Administrator Resistance to Implementation of Teacher Evaluation Policy - Disposition of the Implementors Variable

Response	Tchrs.	Prins.	Supts.	Total
Time; support resources not adequate	14	17	8	39
Need more training; improved empirical base	3	2	1	6
Role confusion between summative/formative evaluation; lack of direction	2	3	0	5
Lack of commitment to implementing policy	2	0	2	4
Lack of central office support	0	3	0	3
Unclear articulation between evaluation policies; teacher evaluation focus too diffuse	0	0	3	3
Negative effect on student-teacher time	0	0	2	2
Negativism associated with a teacher dismissal; need for more positive emphasis	0	0	2	2
Communicating evaluation results to teachers	1	0	0	1
No problems with it	8	5	12	25

note: Tchrs.=Teachers, Prins.=Principals, Supts.=Superintendents.

Most administrative respondents qualified their response with a statement that even though problem areas exist, their commitment to implementing teacher evaluation policy was not lessened by the existence of the problem areas.

Inadequate time for implementation of teacher evaluation policy was discussed in Chapter Five in relationship to Policy Resources, but it warrants repetition here in that this factor was the most frequently mentioned item that had presented a problem to implementors. Perhaps most importantly, principal respondents, who are crucial to the teacher evaluation process, expressed their concern over time and inadequate resources twice as often as superintendent respondents. Teacher respondents identified this area as a problem for their principals almost as often as the principal respondents, lending credibility to the principal respondents' concerns.

Lack of time may be an excuse used by some administrators to avoid a complex, difficult and demanding process (Mireau, 1986). On the other hand, the fact that this problem is identified by so many respondents argues for implementation strategies at all levels that confront this concern directly in order to remove it as a real or perceptual barrier to successful implementation of teacher evaluation policy.

Teacher and principal respondent categories also exhibited close agreement in terms of the numbers of responses relative to the need for evaluators to have more training and an improved empirical basis for evaluation, and to the existence of role confusion between summative and formative evaluative efforts and the lack of direction with respect to the overall teacher evaluation processes.

The other response categories noted in Table 14 were identified by only one to three respondents in one respondent category, but again the areas of concern warrant review by policy implementors in order to determine the relevance of the specific concern to implementation efforts in a particular jurisdiction.

Twenty-five respondents, primarily superintendents and teachers, indicated they had no problem with implementation. Only five principal respondents indicated no problems with teacher evaluation policy implementation.

The third question relating to disposition of the implementors was asked in the same format of all respondent groups, and queried whether the interviewee thought the Alberta Department of Education's commitment to having the provincial teacher evaluation policy implemented is as strong today as it was in 1984-85 when it was introduced. The responses to this question are summarized in Table 15.

An important theme in the policy literature relates to the importance of policy makers demonstrating a visible and high commitment to implementation of the policy initiatives on an on-going basis. Such a commitment is not percieved by a large proportion of the respondents in the current study. Fifty-nine of ninety respondents believed the Department's commitment to be weaker or were not sure or held no opinion. Administrator respondents held this perspective more often than did teacher respondents, which is unusual given the more direct communication channels between administrators and the Department of Education. Teacher respondents who perceive Departmental commitment to be as strong or stronger may be making an assumption, whereas administrative respondents may perceive directly that departmental commitment has dissipated.

Table 15

Phase II Respondent Perceptions of Departmental Commitment to Implementation of Teacher Evaluation Policy - Disposition of the Implementors Variable

Response	Tchrs.	Prins.	Supts.	Total
As strong or stronger	7	1	1	9
-DOE still sensitive to need	1	6	5	12
-A routine now	6	2	1	9
-Part of MFP commitment	0	0	1	1
Stronger sub-total	14	9	8	31
Weaker	3	1	0	4
-Shifted to boards	1	1	0	2
-Shifted focus to other areas	5	6	6	17
-Less public and political pressure	5	5	4	14
-Lack of dollar resources will limit implementation	1	4	0	5
-Lack of follow-through/monitoring	0	1	11	12
Weaker sub-total	15	18	21	54
Not sure/no opinion	1	3	1	5

note: Tchrs.=Teachers, Prins.=Principals, Supts.=Superintendents, MFP=Management and Finance Plan

Teacher evaluation was accompanied during its initial implementation by a high level of media coverage associated with the Keegstra affair. As noted in Chapter Four, the policy makers were aware of the facilitating effect that the Keegstra incident was having on teacher evaluation policy implementation. In addition, the Department of Education gave teacher evaluation a high priority in the early stages of implementation (King, 1984). Maintaining a high priority and visibility would tax the energies of any organization, so it is not surprising that over time policy implementors would perceive the Department's commitment to be declining. The findings reported here, however, argue for a resurgence of conveying Departmental commitment in the short term, and for a strategy of periodic reinforcement of visible manifestations of Departmental commitment over the long term.

The final question relating to disposition of the implementors was directed only to superintendent respondents, and asked "What is the priority of evaluating teachers for board members?"

Fifteen superintendent interviewees responded that teacher evaluation was a high priority with board members accompanied with a proactive, highly visible advocacy of teacher evaluation by the board. Ten respondents said teacher evaluation was a high priority with their board, but was accompanied by a reactive stance and quiet advocacy. Four superintendent respondents stated teacher evaluation was a moderate priority for their board, and one noted that teacher evaluation was not an issue for the school board.

At the local level superintendents perceive their school boards to be maintaining a high commitment to implementing teacher evaluation policy, with 25 of the 30 jurisdictions sampled reporting a high commitment by their boards to implementation of teacher evaluation policy. Some concern might be expressed that ten of the boards with a high commitment are not seen by their superintendents to be actively demonstrating this commitment and an additional five school boards sampled are percieved to have moderate or low commitment and are also not actively expressing a commitment to implementation of teacher evaluation policy.

Two superintendent respondents commented that interest on their board is declining or shifting to other concerns. If this observation portends a trend, then the perception of many policy implementors that the Department of Education's commitment is declining would only be reinforced by a perception that their own board's commitment is also declining.

In summary, responses to questions regarding the disposition of the implementors indicated a substantial base of support for teacher evaluation policy by members of the teaching profession, but also the presence of a number of concerns, which if not addressed, could result in increasing resistance by teachers to implementation of teacher evaluation policy.

Inadequate time for implementation of teacher evaluation policy was the most frequently mentioned item that had presented a problem to implementors. Perhaps most importantly, principal respondents, who are crucial to the teacher evaluation process, expressed their concern over inadequate time and resources twice as often as superintendent respondents. Teacher respondents identified this area as a problem for their principals almost as often as the principal respondents, lending credibility to the principal respondents' concerns.

Teacher and principal respondent categories also exhibited close agreement in terms of the numbers of responses relative to: 1) the need for evaluators to have more training and an improved empirical basis for evaluation; and 2) the existence of role confusion between summative and formative evaluative efforts and the lack of direction with respect to the overall teacher evaluation processes.

Fifty-nine of the ninety respondents believed the Department of Education's commitment to teacher evaluation policy implementation to be weaker or were not sure or held no opinion. Administrator respondents held this perspective more often than did teacher respondents.

At the local level superintendents perceive their school boards to be maintaining a high commitment to implementing teacher evaluation policy, with 25 of the 30 jurisdictions sampled reporting a high commitment by their boards to implementation of teacher evaluation policy. Concern was expressed by the researcher that ten of the boards with a high commitment are not seen by their superintendents to be actively demonstrating this commitment and an additional five of the thirty school boards sampled are percieved to have moderate or low commitment and are also not actively expressing a commitment to implementation of teacher evaluation policy. The perception of many policy implementors that the Department of Education's commitment is declining could be reinforced by a perception that board commitment is also declining.

Policy Effects

The question addressed here is whether the anticipated policy effects defined by the policy makers are congruent with the perceived policy effects of the policy implementors. This is question 6 of the statement of the problem defined in Chapter One.

In the Phase I interviews respondents were asked, "What idealized policy, relationships, and goals would you hope for to enhance teacher evaluation policy implementation?" Analysis of the responses to this question revealed that ideal policy requirements needed to enhance implementation of teacher evaluation policy would include:

1) more effective personnel resources;
2) better liaison with the Alberta Teachers' Association and universities regarding support structures;
3) institutionalization of teacher evaluation with evaluation seen as a need versus a threat;
4) increased resources, especially in small jurisdictions;
5) more research and development on teacher evaluation processes; and,
6) a clear focus on the improvement of teaching and resultant student learning.

The former Minister of Education, Mr. King, had responded that he viewed teacher evaluation as accomplishing the elimination of incompetent teaching, improvement of the act of teaching, improvement of the overall quality of teaching, and contributing to increased public confidence in the educational system.

Phase II interviewees were asked "What would you look for in making a decision as to whether the policy has been successfully implemented in your jurisdiction?" Responses to this question are summarized in Table 16. Respondents in some cases identified more than one factor, so total responses exceed the number of respondents.

A distinct dichotomy is evident in Table 16 between the responses of teachers versus administrators on the first four response categories. While large proportions of administrator respondents identified evidence teaching was improving, staff satisfaction/positive teacher attitude, and administrative commitment to evaluation as indicators of successful policy implementation, very few teacher respondents identified these factors. On the other hand, two-thirds of the teacher respondents stated that evaluations that were informative/useful to them would be indicative of successful teacher evaluation policy implementation, whereas few administrators suggested this factor.

Table 16

Phase II Respondent Identified Indicators of Successful Implementation of Teacher Evaluation Policy

Response	Tchrs.	Prins.	Supts.	Total
Evidence teaching was improving	3	15	16	34
Staff satisfaction; positive tchr. attitude	4	16	12	32
Informative/useful evaluation	20	4	3	27
Administrative commitment to evaluation	0	7	12	19
Improvement of public confidence in education	3	3	4	10
Clarity/consistency in evaluation criteria	3	5	2	10
Evaluation skills enhanced; improved quality of evaluation	0	4	5	9
Personnel decisions based on teacher evaluation	0	2	4	6
Tchrs. feel evaluation is fair/just	3	0	0	3
More peer/self evaluation	1	0	1	2
Inservice planning informed by evaluation results	0	0	2	2
Good liaison with central office	0	1	0	1

note: Tchrs.=Teachers, Prins.=Principals, Supts.=Superintendents.

A small but similar proportion from each respondent group suggested successful policy implementation would be indicated if public confidence in education was enhanced, and if the clarity and consistency in evaluation criteria were achieved. Nine administrator respondents also suggested enhancement of evaluation skills with resultant improvement in the quality of teacher evaluation, and six stated personnel decision making based on evaluation results would reflect successful teacher evaluation policy implementation.

The remaining four items were mentioned by only one, two or three respondents and were not major themes in the current study, but are relevant indicators of successful teacher evaluation policy implementation cited in the literature (see Townsend, 1984; Wise, et. al., 1985).

Although many administrator respondents identified improvement of instruction as an indicator of successful implementation, most could specify only informal monitoring of this component as a means of determining if it was occurring.

The policy implementors conceptualization of successful policy implementation is relatively congruent with the idealized policy intents identified by the policy makers. Teacher satisfaction with teacher evaluation, useful and informative evaluations, and administrative commitment to teacher evaluation suggested by policy implementors would all be indicative of the institutionalization of teacher evaluation policy which policy makers stated would be an ideal condition. King's objective of elimination of incompetent teaching and improvement of teaching quality is congruent with the implementors' identification of evidence that teaching was improving as an indicator of successful policy implementation. The implementors identification of improvement of public confidence in education is identical to King's stated objective of "contributing to increased public confidence in the educational system".

Numerous points of agreement appear to exist between the perspectives of policy makers and policy implementors regarding what ideal teacher evaluation policy implementation would be like. Granted, concensus likely does not exist on how to best achieve this idealized policy state, but the fact that multiple points of agreement exist between policy makers and implementors suggests that eventual full implementation of teacher evaluation policy is a reasonable objective.

Expectations for Full Implementation

In phase I interviews, policy makers were asked what their perceptions of the current status of teacher evaluation policy implementation were. Analysis of their responses indicated that policy makers did not believe teacher evaluation policy initiatives will dissipate; however, they also did not think that implementation is anywhere near complete.

Administrative policy implementors in phase II interviews were asked, how many schools, if any, have implemented the teacher evaluation policy, either fully or partly in their jurisdictions.

Twenty-three principal and nineteen superintendent respondents stated teacher evaluation policy had been fully implemented in their jurisdiction. Six of these forty-two respondents qualified their statement that "fully" meant in terms of the mechanics of the policy. That is, the policy standards were in place, but the policy effects, characteristics of the implementors, etc., may be yet lacking.

Seven principal and 11 superintendent respondents stated teacher evaluation policy had been partially implemented in their jurisdiction. These respondents often cited implementation barriers, such as time, the newness of the policy, or the discomfort of principals with it as factors which had inhibited full implementation.

The researcher was surprised that such a high proportion of respondents (42/60) were willing to characterize teacher evaluation policy as fully implemented, despite the fact that earlier questions in the interview identified areas where implementation barriers existed. Essentially, most administrator respondents seemed comfortable with a fairly superficial definition of full policy implementation. This may have been due to the mandatory nature of teacher evaluation policy implementation that the provincial policy makers created and the resultant pressure on implementors to demonstrate full implementation.

Ironcially, the interviews with the policy makers revealed that they believed teacher evaluation policy to be in the process of implementation, but that full implementation was a longer term process, and one that may require adjustments in terms of resources, characteristics of the implementing agencies, policy standards, etc., before full implementation could be expected.

A communication gap seems to exist between the expectations of the policy makers and the policy implementors relative to a realistic timeline for full implementation of teacher evaluation policy. This question of full implementation and the realistic time frames and mechanisms required to achieve it is a topic which will require further dialogue between policy makers and implementors.

Anticipated Future Needs

Policy makers suggested that teacher evaluation in the future will likely require the creation of mechanisms that will provide for more teacher involvement in the evolution of teacher evaluation processes in Alberta. In addition, the expertise base and resources in support of teacher evaluation will need enhancement. Court cases questioning the expertise of evaluators and collective agreement negotiations focusing on teacher evaluation procedures might also be future forces shaping teacher evaluation in the province.

All three levels of policy implementors were asked if there were any future needs, supports or adjustments which they thought might be necessary to assure that teacher evaluation has a positive influence in their school or jurisdiction. These responses are summarized in Table 17. Respondents may have identified more than one factor; therefore, the number of responses exceed the number of respondents.

Table 17

Phase II Respondent Identified Future Needs, Supports or Adjustments Necessary for Successful Implementation of Teacher Evaluation Policy

Response	Tchrs.	Prins.	Supts.	Total
Evaluate teacher evaluation processes to improve it; improve evaluator skills-curricular knowledge	9	15	17	41
Assure emphasis is on teacher improvement	11	14	12	37
Periodic orientations for tchrs. to reduce cynicism and build trust	10	7	5	22
More time allocated to evaluation process	2	11	7	20
Support peer evaluation; develop master tchr concept or merit programs	4	2	6	12
More regular evaluations than a 3-5 year cycle	6	1	0	7
Standardize evaluation frameworks	0	4	1	5
Improve articulation of evaluation policies	1	2	2	5
Improve due process with 2nd or 3rd party experts	3	0	0	3
Assure public is more aware of procedures	0	1	1	2
Other*	0	0	2	2

note: Tchrs.=Teachers, Prins.=Principals, Supts.=Superintendents.
* explained in text below

The policy makers' perspectives that future requirements will involve increased expertise, resources, and teacher involvement are largely upheld by the perspectives of the policy implementors. The first response category and most frequently mentioned factor reported in Table 17 identifies the need for improved teacher evaluation expertise within the school jurisdictions. The third response category in Table 17, providing orientations for teachers, represents a mechanism by which teacher ownership of teacher evaluation policy may be increased. The fourth response category in Table 17, regarding more time, relates directly to the need for additional resources in support of teacher evaluation policy implementation and reinforces the findings presented earlier relative to the policy resources and disposition of the implementors variable clusters of the Van Horn and Van Meter (1977) policy implementation model. Principals identified the need for more time more frequently than teacher and superintendent respondents combined. These three response categories are similar to the future needs identified by policy makers.

The second response category in Table 17, assuring teacher evaluation emphasizes teacher improvement, is a call by these respondents to maintain the focus of teacher evaluation on formative evaluation versus summative evaluation. This response is consistent with the finding reported earlier that policy intents at the jurisdictional level were primarily formative.

Development of peer evaluation, master teachers or merit programs, noted by twelve respondents, are variations on the desire for an emphasis on teacher improvement. Interestingly, six teacher respondents but only one administrator respondent suggested a future need for more regular evaluations for tenured teachers than the current three to five year cycle required by most jurisdictional policies. A need for standardized teacher evaluation frameworks was identified mainly by principal respondents.

The need for articulation between evaluation policies refers to the five levels of evaluation (student, teacher, program, school and system evaluation) required by the Department of Education's Management and Finance Plan .

"Other" needs noted in Table 17 were suggested by two superintendent respondents, and included need for: a provincial policy on administrator evaluation, an expanded principals' role in summative evaluation, and concentrating evaluation on weak teachers.

In summary, the scope and frequency of factors which were thought by respondents to be necessary for positive teacher evaluation policy outcomes present an outline for a specific needs assessment of teacher evaluation policy implementation at the local level. Provincial policy makers expressed awareness of the need for adjustments, and the needs identified here by policy implementors pinpoint the types of adjustments which may be required for ultimately successful implementation.

Summary and Conclusions

The Disposition of the Implementors variable cluster of the Van Horn and Van Meter (1977) policy implementation model was discussed in Chapter Seven. In addition, the implementors perceptions of policy effects and anticipated future needs associated with the implementation of teacher evaluation policy in Alberta was presented and compared to the perceptions of the policy makers.

Responses to questions regarding the disposition of the implementors indicated a substantial base of support for teacher evaluation policy by members of the teaching profession, but also the presence of a number of concerns, which if not addressed, could result in increasing resistance by teachers to implementation of teacher evaluation policy in Alberta. The most frequent source of resistance perceived by teachers, but largely missed by administrators, was subjective, insufficient or invalid bases of teacher evaluation. Other sources of resistance identified by all three respondent groups included the role of the principal relative to formative versus summative evaluation; the stress, anxiety and exhaustion associated with evaluation; and the unequal application of teacher evaluation across staffs.

Interestingly, administrative respondents identified the stress/anxiety factor more often than the one teacher respondent who noted this phenomenon. Other sources of resistance were noted by only one or two respondents, but the responses do identify potential sources of resistance by teachers and are therefore worthy of note by policy implementors as a potential problem area in a particular jurisdictional setting.

In response to a question regarding administrator resistance to implementation, principal respondents, expressed their concern over time and inadequate resources twice as often as superintendent respondents. Teacher respondents identified this area as a problem for their principals almost as often as the principal respondents, lending credibility to the principal respondents' concerns. The fact that this problem is identified by so many respondents argues for implementation strategies at all levels that confront this concern directly in order to remove it as a real or perceptual barrier to successful implementation of teacher evaluation policy.

Teacher and principal respondent categories also exhibited close agreement in terms of the numbers of responses relative to the need for evaluators to have more training and an improved empirical basis for evaluation, and to the existence of role confusion between summative and formative evaluative efforts and the lack of direction with respect to the overall teacher evaluation processes.

Twenty-five of ninety respondents, primarily superintendents and teachers, indicated administrators had no problem with implementation. Only five of the thirty principal respondents indicated no problems with teacher evaluation policy implementation.

Numerous points of agreement appear to exist between the perspectives of policy makers and policy implementors regarding what ideal or successful teacher evaluation policy implementation would be like. Concensus regarding how to best achieve this idealized policy may not exist, but the fact that multiple points of agreement between policy makers and implementors were identified suggests that eventual full implementation of teacher evaluation policy is a reasonable objective. Teacher satisfaction with teacher evaluation, useful and informative evaluations, and administrative commitment to teacher evaluation suggested by policy implementors as indicative of successful implementation, would all be evidence of the institutionalization of teacher evaluation policy which policy makers stated would be an ideal condition. King's objective of elimination of incompetent teaching and improvement of teaching quality is congruent with the implementors' identification of evidence that teaching was improving as an indicator of successful policy implementation. The implementors identification of improvement of public confidence in education is identical to King's stated objective of "contributing to increased public confidence in the educational system".

Interviews with the policy makers revealed that they believed teacher evaluation policy was in the process of implementation, but that full implementation was a longer term process, and one that may require adjustments in terms of resources, characteristics of the implementing agencies, policy standards, etc., before full implementation could be expected.

However, most administrator respondents seemed comfortable with a fairly superficial definition of full policy implementation. This may have been due to the mandatory nature of teacher evaluation policy implementation that the provincial policy makers created and the resultant pressure on implementors to demonstrate full implementation.

A communication gap seems to exist between the expectations of the policy makers and the policy implementors relative to a realistic timeline for full implementation of teacher evaluation policy. This question of full implementation and the realistic time frames and mechanisms required to achieve it, is a topic which will require further dialogue between policy makers and implementors.

The policy makers' perspectives that future requirements will involve increased expertise, resources, and teacher involvement are largely upheld by the perspectives of the policy implementors.

The scope and frequency of factors which were thought by respondents to be necessary for positive teacher evaluation policy outcomes in the future present an outline for a needs assessment of teacher evaluation policy implementation at the local level. Provincial policy makers expressed awareness of the need for adjustments, and the needs identified here by policy implementors pinpoint the types of adjustments which may be required for ultimately successful implementation.

CHAPTER EIGHT

Analysis of Policy Documents and Evaluation Instruments

Introduction

The research question assessed in Chapter Eight investigates the similarities and differences evident in Alberta school jurisdictions' teacher evaluation policies and instruments, and whether the written teacher evaluation policies and instruments are supported by the study findings.

Policy Documents Analysis

Policy documents were analyzed using a content analysis procedure whereby the policy documents were first overviewed for the purpose of defining common general categories. A second level of analysis was then carried out whereby each policy document was meticulously analyzed to define policy document content relative to the general categories identified in the first level analysis.

The general categories defined by the first level of analysis include:

1) underlying philosophy,
2) purpose/intents,
3) role responsibilities,

4) guidelines and procedures,

5) appeal procedures.

Each general category will be presented separately.

Underlying Philosophy

Five sub-categories relative to the underlying philosophy emerged and are summarized in Table 18.

Table 18

Underlying Philosophies Identified in the Analysis of Policy Documents

Sub-category	n	per cent*
Total jurisdictions with a statement of underlying philosophy	23	77
Evaluation crucial/a board priority	14	47
Evaluation as a positive process	12	40
Teacher's right to know a common evaluation criteria	7	23
Theological basis for evaluation	6	20
Teacher's right to a written evaluation	4	13

*rounded to the nearest per cent

Seventy-seven per cent of the jurisdictions' policy documents opened with a preamble which defined the jurisdictions philosophy relative to teacher evaluation policy. Fourteen or forty-seven per cent of the documents contained a statement that evaluation was a crucial process or was an important priority to the school board. Twelve documents or forty per cent noted that teacher evaluation was intended to be a positive process based on such concepts as trust, respect, etc. Seven jurisdictions noted that teacher evaluation is based, partly at least, on the teacher's right to a common evaluation criteria, and four jurisdictions stated the teacher's right to a written evaluation of their professional performance. Lastly, six of the seven Catholic Separate School Districts sampled included reference to the theological basis for teacher evaluation based on Christian values, such as love as exemplified in the teachings of Christ.

Although a philosophical statement advocating prioritization of implementation or a positive implementation environment cannot guarantee that such processes actually occur, statements advocating processes such as these are desirable. Besides defining the underlying philosophy, such statements clarify the local jurisdictions' policy standards and thereby support the policy intents which local policy implementors are responsible for carrying out. The fact that local implementors perceived policy intents at the local level to be more formative than provincial policy intents may be due in part to the fact that local policy documents explicate intents more throughly through the underlying philosophies examined above.

Policy Purpose and Intents

Twelve sub-categories relative to purpose and intents were identified and are summarized in Table 19.

Table 19

Purposes and Intents Identified in the Analysis of Policy Documents

Sub-category	n	per cent*
Improve instruction	30	100
Personnel decisions	20	67
Continous contract	17	57
Permanent certification	17	57
Professional development	16	53
Affirm/support the teacher	16	53
Formative purposes defined	16	53
Summative purposes defined	16	53
Promotion	14	47
Dismissal	13	43
Transfer	12	40
Inservice needs assessment	3	10

*rounded to the nearest per cent

All of the jurisdictions' policy documents identified improvement of instruction as a policy intent which is congruent with provincial policy intents defined in the Program Policy Manual (1984:72) which states,

> The performance of individual teachers and the quality of teaching practices across the province will be evaluated to assist in the provision of effective instruction to

students and in the professional growth and development of teachers.

There is less congruence between local policy documents and provincial policy intents with respect to the professional growth and development of teachers. Only sixteen or fifty-three per cent of the policy documents mentioned teacher professional development specifically as a policy intent. Sixteen documents also noted affirmation, reinforcement or support for teachers as a policy intent or purpose.

Personnel decisions were mentioned more frequently as a policy intent by sixty-seven per cent of the jurisdictions. Seventeen, or fifty-seven per cent, of the jurisdictions noted continuous contract decisions or permanent certification decisions as a purpose of teacher evaluation. Promotion, dismissal and transfer personnel decisions were stated in forty-seven per cent, forty-three per cent and forty per cent of the policy documents respectively. It is clear that, in terms of the content of the policy documents, personnel decision making as a function of teacher evaluation is a more important purpose than professional development of teachers.

Slightly more than half of the documents or fifty-three per cent contained explicit clarification of formative versus summative evaluation purposes. Lastly, only three jurisdictions linked teacher evaluation purposes to clarification of teacher inservice needs within the policy documents.

Role Responsibilities

Role responsibilities refer to role descriptions of personnel assigned specific duties within teacher evaluation policy documents. Superintendents and principals are most often identified as having specific role responsiblities in the policy documents. Twenty-four documents delineate superintendent responsibilities specifically, and twenty-five documents define principal responsibilities. Assistant superintendent roles are defined in sixteen documents, and six documents define roles for vice-principals specifically.

Interestingly, only five documents defined roles of teachers relative to teacher evaluation, and three documents refer to school board members roles. The relative absence of teacher role responsibilities in policy documents may present an area where jurisdictions may wish to review need for future adaptation of current policy documents and may provide an avenue to provide for greater teacher ownership of teacher evaluation policy.

Policy documents that did not contain specific explication of personnel role responsibilities generally relied on implicit role delineation. Such documents might be reviewed by jurisdictional staff to determine whether personnel role responsibilities have been adequately understood in these jurisdictions.

Guidelines and Procedures

Guidelines and procedures represent the largest amount of policy content in terms of the number of sub-categories and are summarized in Tables 20 and 21.

Table 20

Guidelines and Procedures Identified in the Analysis of Policy Documents

Sub-category	n	per cent*
Disposition of reports	27	90
Post-conference required	23	77
Post-conference suggested	2	7
Evaluation criteria specified	21	70
Teacher role expectations specified	3	10
Access to reports specified	21	70
Self-evaluation encouraged	19	63
Peer evaluation encouraged	14	47
Remedial process specified	12	40
Evaluation instruments specified	11	37
Pre-conference required	3	10
Pre-conference suggested	7	23
Evaluation time specified	9	30
Unannounced visits permitted	5	17
Unannounced visits prohibited	1	3

*rounded to the nearest per cent

Table 21

Staff Evaluation Schedules Identified in the Analysis of Policy Documents

Sub-category	n	per cent*
Teachers on temporary contract		
Annually	10	33
Semi-annually	9	30
Tri-annually	6	20
More than tri-annually	5	17
Tenured with interim certificates		
Annually	17	57
Semi-annually	12	40
Tri-annually	0	0
More than tri-annually	1	3
Tenured with permanent certificates		
Annually	3	10
Every two years	4	13
Every three years	12	40
More than every three years	11	37

*rounded to the nearest per cent

Ninety per cent of the policy documents specify the procedures to be followed in the disposition of teacher evaluation reports (i.e. where reports are to be filed). Twenty-one jurisdictions or seventy per cent also specify procedures to be followed in gaining access to evaluation reports once they are on file. There is some variation within this category regarding levels of specificity, with some documents specifying teacher access only while other documents elaborate who else may have access to teacher evaluation files and under what conditions.

Twenty-five jurisdictions or 83 per cent of the sample specify in their policy documents that post-evaluation conferences either must be held or should be held. Seventy-seven per cent of the jurisdictions place a strong emphasis on post-conferencing by mandating it in their policies.

Pre-conferencing, a key component of clinical supervision, receives much less emphasis in the policy documents. Only three jurisdictions or ten per cent require pre-conferences, and an additional seven jurisdictions or 23 per cent suggest its use.

Also important to local policy writers were the inclusion of either specific evaluation criteria or more general teacher role expectations as a guide to what teacher evaluation will focus on. Twenty-four of the thirty policy documents sampled included such criteria.

Self-evaluation and/or peer evaluation were encouraged by nineteen and fourteen of the jurisdictions respectively. These two concepts were closely related. In only one case was peer evaluation advocated without a concomitant reference to self-evaluation.

Twelve jurisdictions elaborated within their policy documents what form a remedial process should take in the event a teacher received an evaluation indicative of teacher weaknesses. The specific teacher evaluation instrument to be used was dictated in policy by eleven jurisdictions.

Evaluation time specification refers to when in the school year evaluation should occur. Nine jurisdictions included such specifications in the policy documents.

As an indication of local variations in teacher evaluation sensitivities, five jurisdictions explicitly stated the permissibility of unannounced visits by evaluators to teachers' classrooms and one jurisdiction specifically prohibited such evaluations.

Guidelines and procedures universally addressed the times that evaluations should occur for staff of varying employment classifications. These data are presented in Table 21.

Teachers who are new to a jurisdiction and on temporary contract receive the most intense level of formal teacher evaluation under current policies, with sixty-seven per cent of the policy documents requiring two, three or more formal evaluations in the first year of teaching.

Tenured teachers holding interim certificates, and who after two years of teaching are eligible for permanent certification, receive a comparatively moderate level of scrutiny under present teacher evaluation policies, with one hundred per cent of the policies requiring one, two, or more formal evaluations to support recommendations for permanent certification.

Tenured teachers holding permanent certification receive comparatively minimal levels of evaluation. In fact, seventy-seven per cent of the jurisdictional policies require tenured, permanently certified teachers to be evaluated only once every three to five years. During the phase II interviews with teachers, two respondents commented that teacher evaluation was viewed by tenured teachers as a non-issue primarily affecting the non-tenured staff. These figures help explain why these two interviewees held this point of view.

Alberta Education (1980:13) reported the results of a survey of certificated staff evaluation practices in Alberta and compared the results of the 1980 survey with a similar survey reported by Holdaway in 1977. These data indicated that tenured teachers were evaluated annually by only six per cent of Alberta school jurisdictions in 1977 and by eleven per cent in 1980. This compares to the 10 per cent of jurisdictions who require annual evaluation of tenured staff in 1987. Apparently the teacher evaluation policy mandates of the Alberta Department of Education have not substantially altered the practices of Alberta school jurisdictions relative to the evaluation of tenured teachers.

The same survey of Alberta Education (1980:13) reported that untenured teachers, either first year or new to the system, were evaluated annually by ninety per cent of Alberta school jurisdictions. Teacher evaluation policies in 1987 require annual evaluation of untenured teachers in thirty-three per cent of the jurisdictions and two or more evaluations a year in sixty-seven per cent of the jurisdictions. These figures indicate that mandated teacher evaluation by the Alberta Department of Education has been interpreted at the local level to mean that untenured teachers should receive the primary emphasis under the policy initiatives of the Department. However, the two policy goals stated by the Department of Education; that of improving instruction and assuring the professional development of teachers, does not necessarily suggest an inordinate emphasis of teacher evaluation on untenured staff.

Appeal Procedures

Appeal procedures were the one clear policy standard which the Alberta Department of Education required local school jurisdictions to include in their teacher evaluation policy documents. Each jurisdiction was required to submit their teacher evaluation policy document to one of five Regional Offices of Education in the province for review, presumably to assure that appeal procedures were included.

The thirty teacher evaluation policy documents were analyzed to determine the structure of the appeal process and these results are summarized in Table 22.

Table 22

Appeal Procedures Identified in the Analysis of Policy Documents

Sub-category	n	per cent*
Appeal Levels		
First -evaluator	9	30
-asst. superintendent	2	7
-superintendent	15	50
-school board/supt.	1	3
Second -superintendent	10	33
-school board	9	30
Third -school board	8	27
Appeal timelines specified	20	67
Appeal basis specified	8	27
Identifies provincial/federal appeal options	5	17
No appeal process	3	10

*rounded to the nearest per cent
note: asst.=assistant, supt.=superintendent

Notable divergence was evident between policy documents regarding the first level of appeal. Half of the policies specified the superintendent as the first level of appeal, but thirty per cent identified the evaluator who authored the contentious report to be the first level of appeal. Larger systems with more specialized central office staffing structures specified the assistant superintendent as the first level of appeal in two jurisdictions. The school board was identified as a first level appeal in one jurisdiction, but for procedural appeals only; matters of substance were to be appealed to the superintendent in this jurisdiction.

Second level appeals were directed to superintendents or the school board and in districts where the superintendent was the second level of appeal, the board was left as the third level of appeal in eight jurisdictions or no third level was specified.

Levels of appeal are in many instances a function of the size of the district. For example, in small jurisdictions where the superintendent is heavily involved in direct evaluation of teachers, there is little recourse within the structure of the jurisdiction but to have the school board act as the appeal mechanism after the superintendent. Other alternatives, however, may be available outside of the jurisdictions' organizational structure. For example, appeal bodies made up of senior administrators in a region, or of education professionals hired on a contract basis are two possible alternatives. The fact that few appeals have arisen, as noted in the phase II interview results, suggest that various alternatives to overly parochial appeal structures may be needed in the future.

Appeal timelines were specified in two-thirds of the policy documents. Timelimes are useful for all parties in an appeal process in eliminating uncertainty regarding when specific actions must be taken in order to maintain ones right to appeal. Policy documents lacking such detail should be updated to correct this deficiency.

Few policy documents specified the bases of appeal. Most policies were simply silent regarding under what circumstances an appeal might be launched. Policy documents that did specify grounds usually identified the circumstance of a teacher disagreeing with the content or conclusions of an evaluation report. One policy distinguished between process and substance grounds for appeal. The question of how specific and what details should be included in the appeal procedures provides an opportunity for further review and adjustment of policy documents within jurisdictions and again may provide a mechanism by which teachers can attain a greater ownership of the teacher evaluation policies.

Only five policy documents identified the existence of provincial or federal legislation which might be available to support an appeal beyond the appeal procedures available to a teacher within their jurisdiction.

Lastly, three of the thirty policy documents contained no appeal process despite the policy standards of the Department of Education. One of the three notes the possibility of appeal without specifying any details regarding procedures. The other two policy documents were written in 1983, before the Departmental appeal requirement, and one of these two policy documents was in the process of revision at the time this study was conducted.

Policy Documents Analysis Summary

The greatest similarities among the thirty policy documents analyzed in this chapter involved the policy intent of improving instruction and the specification of evaluation schedules relative to a teachers employee status. These were the only content areas where all thirty policy documents universally addressed. Most policies also addressed the disposition of reports.

Moderate similarites, where between forty to eighty-five per cent of the documents concurred, included the policy intents of: personnel decisions, continous contract decisions, promotion, transfer and dismissal decisions, permanent certification decisions, affirmation or reinforcement of the teacher, and professional improvement. Formative and summative evaluation was defined in just over half of the documents and the roles of superintendents and principals were defined in eighty and eighty-three per cent of the policies respectively. Procedures for assisting teachers in difficulty or remedial processes were identified in sixty per cent of the documents. Self-evaluation and peer evaluation was encouraged in sixty-three per cent of the documents and post-conferences were required or suggested in eighty-three per cent of the policies. Teacher role expectations or the specific evaluation criteria were identified in eighty per cent of the policy documents.

Appeal procedures were present in most policies and in the three that excluded appeal procedures, one stated the possibility of appeal and another policy document was in the process of revision. Appeal procedures, however, demonstrated a marked lack of similarity with eighty per cent of the documents specifying appeal timelines, and only twenty-seven per cent explicitly stating the bases of appeal. Few documents identified provincial or federal appeal options which may exist outside the local appeal procedures, such as is defined in the Alberta School Act.

Minimal similarities existed among policy documents regarding: teachers' right to known, common evaluation criteria; the relationship of teacher evaluation to assessing jurisdictional inservice needs; roles of teachers within the evaluation process; and pre-conferencing requirements.

These minimally and moderately prevalent items within the policy documents represent potentially useful additions to policy documents which lack them, and as such offer a useful framework for future policy review by jurisdictional staff.

Policy requirements for mandatory evaluation of permanently certified, tenured teachers does not vary significantly from figures reported in a 1980 survey of teacher evaluation practices in Alberta (Alberta Education, 1980:13).

Teacher Evaluation Instruments

Evaluation instruments were analyzed to determine the similarities and differences that existed between jurisdictions. As noted above, eleven teacher evaluation policies mandate the use of a specific instrument. These instruments were collected as were instruments in use by evaluative personnel in the remaining jurisdictions which did not specify evaluation instruments in policy.

The results of the analysis of evaluation instruments is presented in Tables 23 and 24.

Table 23

Teacher Evaluation Instrument Formats Identified in the Analysis of Evaluation Instruments

Sub-category	n	per cent*
Rating scales and anecdotal	15	50
Anecdotal - with criteria	9	30
Anecdotal - no criteria	3	10
Evaluators choice	2	7
Rating scales	1	3

*rounded to the nearest per cent

Table 24

Teacher Evaluation Instrument Structures and Contents Identified in the Analysis of Evaluation Instruments

Sub-category	n	per cent*
Teacher signature required	16	53
Consolidated/summary report	7	23
Evaluation purpose indicated	7	23
Appeal route stated on form	3	10
Teacher role expectations	2	7
Pre/post conference detailed	2	7
Rating scale defined	2	7
Policy/philosophy stated	2	7

*rounded to the nearest per cent

Anecdotal or open ended formats are frequently used in evaluating teachers in Alberta with such formats being used in conjunction with evaluation criteria or rating scales in at least ninety per cent of the jurisdictions sampled.

Teacher evaluation instruments were further analyzed to compare the internal structure and content. This analysis is summarized in Table 24.

A high degree of similarity between teacher evaluation instruments may not necessarily be desirable if the evaluation purposes are tailored to meet unique needs within a particular school jurisdiction. The analysis summarized in Table 24, however, does point out a marked degree of divergence in internal structure between the teacher evaluation instruments in use by Alberta school jurisdictions. Several of these categories represent potentially useful additions to evaluation instruments which currently lack them.

Twenty policy documents mandate teacher signatures as an indication that the individual teacher has seen and/or discussed the results of the evaluation. However, only sixteen of the evaluation instruments provide for this policy requirement.

Consolidated or summary reports, useful in focusing the evaluation results, and evaluation purposes, useful in clarifying the objectives of an evaluation, are included in twenty-three per cent of the instruments.

Few instruments included a statement about the appeal process. This item would be useful since many teachers may not have ready access to the appeal procedures defined in teacher evaluation policy documents. Few instruments included teacher role expectations; however, many instruments included evaluation criteria which accomplishes the same objective of clarifying the criteria on which teachers are evaluated.

Post conferences are required by most jurisdictions, but details regarding such conferences are included on only seven per cent of the evaluation instruments. Rating scales are included in half of the instruments, but are defined in only seven per cent of the instruments. Underlying philosophies are clarified in nearly half of the policy documents analyzed, but again such statements are present in just seven per cent of evaluation instruments.

Creation of a universal teacher evaluation instrument is certainly not advocated. However, review of evaluation instruments by jurisdictional staff using the categories noted in Table 24 as a guide is suggested to assure that evaluation instruments are as comprehensive and detailed as is possible and desirable.

Congruence with Policy Implementation

Phase II interview analysis demonstrated that the most frequently perceived policy intents at the local level were improvement of instruction, board accountability, and personnel decisions. The policy intent of enhancing the teaching profession, that is, providing for professional development, was not perceived as a policy intent by policy implementors at either the provincial or the local level.

Analysis of policy documents demonstrated that one hundred per cent of the documents specified the policy intent of improving instruction but only fifty-three per cent specified the intent of professional development. Provincial policy (Alberta Education, 1984b:72) specifically identifies the intent of ". . .professional growth and development of teachers." The almost total absence of this intent in the perception of policy implementors and in almost half of the policy documents represents an area in need of review by both policy makers and policy implementors.

Policy implementors were asked during phase II interviews if policy expectations were clear with respect to their role responsibilities. Administrator respondents expressed little confusion regarding their policy related responsibilities. Teachers, however, were the least clear regarding their teacher evaluation role responsibilities. The policy documents analysis revealed that superintendents and principals are most often identified as having specific role responsibilities. On the other hand, teachers' roles relative to teacher evaluation policy is addressed in only seventeen per cent of the policy documents. Inclusion of teacher role responsbililities in teacher evaluation documents would likely help to rectify this problem.

Lastly, policy implementors were asked if they were satisfied with the methods used to measure teacher performance. The strongest single theme to emerge from this question was the preference expressed by many respondents for anecdotal evaluation reporting formats. The analysis of teacher evaluation documents found that anecdotal formats, used either independently or in conjuction with rating scales, occured in at least ninety per cent of the jurisdictions sampled. Use of anecdotal formats, identified as commonplace currently, should continue.

Summary and Conclusions

The greatest similarities between the thirty policy documents analyzed in this chapter involved the policy intent of improving instruction and the specification of evaluation schedules relative to a teacher's employee status.

Moderate similarites, where between forty to eighty-five per cent of the documents concurred, included the policy intents of:

personnel decisions, continous contract decisions, promotion, transfer and dismissal decisions, permanent certification decisions, affirmation or reinforcement of the teacher, and professional improvement. Formative and summative evaluation was defined in just over half of the documents and the roles of superintendents and principals were defined in eighty and eighty-three per cent of the policies respectively. Procedures for assisting teachers in difficulty or remedial processes were identified in sixty per cent of the documents. Self-evaluation and peer evaluation was encouraged in sixty-three per cent of the documents and post-conferences were required or suggested in eighty-three per cent of the policies. Teacher role expectations or the specific evaluation criteria were identified in eighty per cent of the policy documents.

Appeal procedures were present in most policies. Appeal procedures, however, demonstrated a marked lack of similarity with eighty per cent of the documents specifying appeal timelines, and only twenty-seven per cent explicitly stating the bases of appeal. Few documents identified provincial or federal appeal options which may exist outside the local appeal procedures, such as is defined in the Alberta School Act.

Minimal similarities existed between policy documents regarding: teachers' right to known, common evaluation criteria; the relationship of teacher evaluation to assessing jurisdictional inservice needs; roles of teachers within the evaluation process; and pre-conferencing requirements.

Minimally and moderately prevalent items within the policy documents represent potentially useful additions to policy documents which lack them, and as such offer a useful framework for future policy review by jurisdictional staff.

Policy requirements for mandatory evaluation of permanently certified, tenured teachers does not differ markedly from figures reported in a 1980 survey of teacher evaluation practices in Alberta (Alberta Education, 1980:13).

Evaluation instruments were also analyzed to determine the similarities and differences that existed between jurisdictions and to compare the internal structure and content of the instruments. A marked degree of divergence in internal structure between the teacher evaluation instruments in use by Alberta school jurisdictions was identified. Several of these categories represent potentially useful additions to evaluation instruments which currently lack them.

Consolidated or summary reports, useful in focusing the evaluation results, and evaluation purposes, useful in clarifying the objectives of an evaluation, are included in twenty-three per cent of the instruments. Few instruments included a statement about the appeal process. This item would be useful since many teachers may not have ready access to the appeal procedures defined in teacher evaluation policy documents. Post conferences are required by most jurisdictions, but details regarding such conferences are included on only seven per cent of the evaluation instruments. Rating scales are included in half of the instruments, but are defined in only seven per cent of the instruments. Underlying philosophies are clarified in nearly half of the policy documents analyzed, but again such statements are present in just seven per cent of evaluation instruments.

Creation of a universal teacher evaluation instrument was not suggested; however, review of evaluation instruments by jurisdictional staff, using the categories noted above, is suggested to assure that evaluation instruments are as comprehensive as desired.

Congruence between teacher evaluation policy implementation findings and policy documents and evaluation instruments was reviewed relative to policy intents, role responsibilities and preferred evaluation instrument formats. Analysis of policy documents demonstrated that one hundred per cent of the documents specified the policy intent of improving instruction but only fifty-three per cent specified the intent of professional development. The almost total absence of this intent in the perception of policy implementors and in almost half of the policy documents represents an area in need of review by both policy makers and policy implementors.

Superintendents and principals are most often identified as having specific role responsibilities; however, teachers' roles relative to teacher evaluation policy is addressed in only seventeen per cent of the policy documents. Inclusion of teacher role responsbililities in teacher evaluation policy documents would help to rectify these ambiguities.

Lastly, policy implementors were asked if they were satisfied with the methods used to measure teacher performance.

The strongest single theme to emerge from this question was the preference expressed by many respondents for anecdotal evaluation reporting formats. The analysis of teacher evaluation documents found that anecdotal formats, used either independently or in conjuction with rating scales, occured in at least ninety per cent of the jurisdictions sampled. Use of anecdotal formats, identified as commonplace currently, should continue.

CHAPTER NINE

Summary, Conclusions and Implications

Introduction

A summary of the purposes and procedures of the study, conclusions, and implications for theory, practice and further research are presented in Chapter Nine.

Summary of the Study

This study investigated the degree of teacher evaluation policy implementation in Alberta. The essential questions and sub-questions addressed were as follows:

1. What events affected teacher evaluation policy adoption and implementation in Alberta?
    a. What were the policy intents held by the policy makers?
    b. What social structures or informal networks affected the policy process?
    c. What were the anticipated ideal policy intents of the policy makers?
    d. What were the perceptions of policy makers of the current status and possible future outcomes of teacher evaluation policy?

2. What were the percevied policy intents held by policy implementors and were perceptions of intents between policy makers and implementors congruent?

3. To what degree have policy standards and resources affected teacher evaluation policy implementation?

4. To what degree have communications, enforcements, characteristics of the implementing agencies, political environment, and socio-economic environment variables affected teacher evaluation policy implementation?

5. To what degree has the disposition of implementors affected policy implementation?

6. What were the policy effects perceived by policy implementors and were perceptions of effects between policy makers and implementors congruent?

7. How similar were the expectations of policy makers and implementors for full implementation of teacher evaluation policy?

8. What future adjustments to teacher evaluation policy implementation were perceived to be needed by policy makers and policy implementors?

9. What were the similarities and differences evident in Alberta school jurisdiction's teacher evaluation policies and instruments, and were the written teacher evaluation policies and instruments supported by the study findings?

Research Design and Methodology

This study employed a descriptive survey design or what Dunn (1981:297) describes as a "case survey" which involves procedures to identify and analyze factors that account for variations in the implementation of policies. This method required the researcher to first develop a case coding scheme of categories that captured key components of policy inputs and processes.

The information required for the study was secured through interviews and documents analysis. The first phase of the study was primarily qualitative, using semi-structured interviews with selected key decision makers and leaders in teacher evaluation in Alberta. Snowball sampling with key leaders and decision makers was used to identify this sample, that is, the first person interviewed, a former Minister of Education for Alberta, was asked to recommend others (Bogdan and Biklen, 1982:66).

Interview transcripts from phase I were typed and returned to interviewees who were asked to review the transcript for any errors or misinterpretations. Coding procedures recommended by Bogdan and Biklen (1982:158) guided the structure and analysis of these interview protocols.

Phase II interview schedules were constructed to solicit responses from the policy implementors, that is, teachers, principals and superintendents or their designates regarding their perceptions of teacher evaluation policy implementation. Phase II interview schedules were determined by findings from phase I interviews with policy makers and by the variable clusters identified in the Van Horn and Van Meter (1977) policy implementation model.

Initial drafts of the interview schedules were reviewed for face validity by two doctoral students and three professors in the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Alberta. The second draft versions of the interview schedules were then subjected to pilot testing in the field through simulated interviews with two assistant superintendents, two principals and two teachers. This pilot testing was intended to eliminate any terms which were vague or ambiguous, and to improve construct validity by eliciting respondents perceptions of the degree of comprehensiveness represented by the interview schedules relative to teacher evaluation policy implementation. Final adjustments were made to the interview schedules based on the pilot interviews and these revised interview schedules were used in conducting phase II interviews. The interview schedules are presented in Appendices A through C.

Within the context of the phase II interviews, if any confusion or ambiguity seemed to be present at any point in the interview, the researcher confirmed the interviewee's reponse with the interviewee.

The field-based, structured interviews permitted the researcher to experience more in-depth analysis of teacher evaluation policy implementation with practitioners in the field than would have been possible through quantitative, closed-ended survey research methodology.

Phase II interview interpretation involved a qualitative analysis to identify themes and patterns of reponses in relationship to the research questions and the Van Horn and Van Meter (1977) policy implementation model.

Thirty of 146 active Alberta school jurisdictions were randomly selected from the Alberta School Jurisdiction List, 1986 for inclusion in this study. In order to assure a representative sample of jurisdictions, the population of jurisdictions was stratified on the basis of type of jurisdiction and geographic zone. Jurisdictions were then selected from each stratified grouping using a random numbers table.

Letters requesting each jurisdiction's participation in the study were posted on September 5, 1986. A copy of this correspondence is presented in Appendix D. Five of the thirty jurisdictions initially contacted declined involvement in the study on the basis of over-involvement with research studies or simply being too busy to participate. Alternative jurisdictions randomly selected within the same stratified grouping were subsequently contacted and all agreed to participate. Within each of the thirty jurisdictions, interviews were arranged with the superintendent or designate and a principal and a teacher randomly choosen from the jurisdictions staff list. The principal and teacher respondents were selected from the same school. The ninety phase II interviews began on October 28, 1986 and were completed on February 23, 1987.

School district teacher evaluation policy documents, obtained from each sampled jurisdiction, were studied using a content analysis procedure. In addition, school administrators interviewed were asked for copies of teacher evaluation instruments (recording/reporting forms) which they used for teacher evaluation. A content analysis of these instruments was completed and is reported in Chapter Eight.

Conditions Affecting Policy Adoption

Among senior management in the Department of Education there existed a high degree of concensus regarding the intents of teacher evaluation policy. All respondents within the Department concurred with the focus on improvement of instruction, while many also saw it as a mechanism to improve teacher professionalism. One Assistant Deputy Minister stated it was a means of demonstrating accountability to the public. The perspectives of senior management in the Department of Education were congruent with the former Minister of Education's views.

Teacher evaluation policy adoption by senior management in the Alberta Department of Education can be characterized as an evolutionary response to a series of events over a period of approximately 16 years, dating from the introduction of locally appointed superintendents in 1971.

Respondents indicated a high degree of concensus regarding several factors which affected the adoption of teacher evaluation policy by the Alberta Department of Education, including:

1) the Teaching Professions Act negotiations breakdown;
2) the general absense of routine teacher evaluation under locally appointed superintendents;
3) the perceived need for improvement in the quality of instruction and diffuse environmental demands for accountability;
4) specific concerns regarding the need for teacher evaluation by the Premier and caucus;
5) the opportunity of linking teacher evaluation to a policy driven, post-audit Management and Finance program thrust by the Department of Education;
6) the logical connection between policy implementation of student evaluation and the need for concomitant teacher evaluation policy;
7) lack of action on teacher evaluation by the Alberta Teachers' Association or local school jurisdictions; and,
8) solidarity and concensus among senior management in the Department of Education regarding the policy directions necessary in response to the above.

Conditions Affecting Policy Implementation

Teacher evaluation policy implementation was strongly affected by a specific environmental event, the Keegstra affair, and by the internal development of the Management and Finance Plan of the Alberta Department of Education. Other factors which were seen as affecting the implementation process included:

1) the Alberta Teachers' Association position on formative and summative evaluation as a barrier to implementation;
2) the Department's requirement of teacher evaluation policy approval which served as a potential source of misunderstanding;
3) the under-supply of staff skilled in teacher evaluation;
4) the effect of role shifts from consulting to monitoring in the Regional Offices of Education;
5) the support of the Alberta School Trustees' Association and the Council of Alberta School Superintendents;
6) the difficulty of the appeal process in small jurisdictions;
7) the visible and practical support of the Mireau inservice materials; and,
8) the former Minister of Education's interest in evaluation in educational systems.

Most phase I interviewees perceived the Keegstra affair, a widely publized case involving an Alberta teacher who was dismissed for teaching anti-Semitic doctrine in his Social Studies classes (David, 1983), as a catalyst to teacher evaluation policy implementation in terms of limiting the potential resistance of the Alberta Teachers' Association, and in keeping public awareness of the issue high. Only the former Minister of Education noted the potential negative effect of the Keegstra affair with respect to its limiting opportunity for teacher input into the policy development process at the local jurisdictional level.

The Keegstra affair represents a classic example of how an extraneous, environmental event can dramatically affect the policy implementation process.

The Management and Finance Plan of the Alberta Department of Education represents an important teacher evaluation policy implementation vehicle. The high visibility of the MFP, and the commitment to it by senior management in the Department, coupled with the symbolic if not real requirement of teacher evaluation policy implementation by local jurisdictions as a pre-requisite for funding, resulted in the policy maker interviewees perceiving it as a powerful implementation instrument.

The Alberta Teachers' Association was perceived by senior management in the Department of Education as a barrier to implementation in terms of its insistence that formative and summative functions of evaluation must be separate, and in terms of its general organizational role.

Teacher evaluation policy was the only policy that had to be approved by the Department of Education. While this policy standard was meant to facilitate the process, in some cases it caused some misunderstanding regarding the role of the department in the policy development process, or resistance to the requirement by policy implementors.

Concerns regarding the undersupply of skilled evaluative staff, role shifts from consultation to monitoring by the Department's Regional Offices of Education, and problems with appeal processes in small jurisdictions were mentioned by only one or two interviewees, but provide useful points of comparison with the characteristics of the implementing agency, communications, and resource variables of the Van Horn and Van Meter (1977) policy implementation model.

Likewise, Alberta School Trustees' Association and Council of Alberta School Superintendents' support for teacher evaluation policy, the Mireau teacher evaluation inservice materials produced by the Department of Education and the former Minister's ongoing interest in evaluation were mentioned by one interviewee, but these themes are relevant to the policy implementation model used in the study.

Social Structures or Informal Networks

Informal networks or their absense played an important role in the development of teacher evaluation policy in Alberta. Specifically, informal contacts with the Alberta School Trustees' Association seem to have provided for better communications between the Department of Education and that body. The absence of informal communication mechanisms between the Department and the Alberta Teachers' Association may have exacerbated the tensions between the ATA and Department with respect to teacher evaluation policy development.

Policy Intents

Overall, the policy implementors in the field perceive the purposes or intents of teacher evaluation at the provincial level largely as a demonstration of accountability or a Department of Education response to political events. One third of the respondents did perceive the intent of improving teaching;

however, only one respondent identified enhancement of the teaching profession as an intent of provincial policy.

On the other hand, 74 of 90 respondents linked improvement of teaching as a policy intent at the jurisdictional level, suggesting that a translation of this policy intent between organizational levels has occurred. Essentially, implementors perceive teacher evaluation policy at the provincial level to have a summative emphasis intended to demonstrate accountability, and at the jurisdictional level to have a formative emphasis intended to assist teachers to improve their instruction.

The enhancement of the professional status of teaching as a policy intent was also absent at the jurisdictional level. Since ". . .professional growth and development of teachers" (Alberta Education, 1984:72) is a stated intent of provincial teacher evaluation policy and was underscored as a policy intent by most of the policy makers, the almost complete absence of this policy intent in the perception of policy implementors warrants careful consideration by both policy makers and policy implementors.

Policy Standards and Resources

Due process requirements as a policy standard have not presented any difficulties for policy implementors, but this area is also largely untested with none of the thirty jurisdictions sampled reporting an appeal to the formal stage. Concerns were expressed, primarily by superintendents, about problems of appeal procedures in small jurisdictions.

Policy resources were not assessed through direct questions in phase II interviews, but content analysis of the interview database revealed that concerns over "time" as a resource for teacher evaluation policy implementation occurred frequently.

Within the Alberta context, the variable clusters, policy standards and policy resources reflect minimal provincial involvement relative to teacher evaluation policy implementation.

General Impressions of the Policy Implementors

General impressions of policy implementors reveal that superintendent respondents are most positive regarding teacher evaluation policy implementation, and teachers are least positive. However, teacher respondents expressed more positive than negative comments regarding their general impressions of teacher evaluation policy implementation.

Process Variable Effects on Implementation

Five process variables from the Van Horn and Van Meter (1977) policy implementation model, communications, enforcements, characteristics of the implementing agency, political environments and socio-economic environments were examined in relationship to phase II interviews and in terms of their effect on teacher evaluation policy implementation in Alberta.

Communications

Communications regarding role responsibilities relative to teacher evaluation are clearer for administrators than for teacher respondents. This finding is not surprising given the recognition that teachers felt they had less opportunity for input into policy formulation than did the administrator respondents. Some clarification of policy, particlularly for teachers, but also for principals and superintendents in several jurisdictions is needed.

Enforcements

Administrator respondents view the enforcements used to induce teacher cooperation with teacher evaluation policy as a more positive process than do the teacher respondents. However, the emphasis on improvement of instruction given to jurisdictional level policy intents is apparent in the prepondance of normative enforcement strategies reported by administrators at the local level of implementation.

Twenty-seven superintendent respondents reacted either favorably or with mixed support for provincial enforcement strategies. However, 18 superintendent respondents made suggestions regarding how provincial enforcements might be adjusted which indicates a need to review enforcement strategies by provincial officials.

Characteristics of the Implementing Agency

Characteristics of the implementing agency refers to the technical capacity of the school jurisdiction to implement policy. In 12 of the 30 jurisdictions sampled, principals are primarily responsible for all teacher evaluation, with central office personnel providing only a backup role when needed. In the other 18 jurisdictions sampled teacher evaluation is a shared responsibility between principal and superintendent.

It is significant that few jurisdictions have given a priority to teacher inservice on teacher evaluation specifically. Several administrator respondents commented that the professional development concern/priorities have passed on to other needs. It is clear that principals have had opportunity to experience some inservice training in support of their teacher evaluation responsibilities. Superintendent respondents, like their principal counterparts, have had opportunity to experience some inservice training in support of their evaluation activities. Principals suggested a greater need for additional inservice training than did superintendents.

The strongest single theme to emerge from analysis of the question about satisfaction with evaluation methods in use was the preference expressed by many respondents for anecdotal evaluation reporting formats. Overall 64 of 90 respondents expressed high or moderate levels of satisfaction with methods used to evaluate teacher performance, however, divergence of opinion regarding evaluation methodology supports the wisdom of designing evaluation methodology to fit local evaluation intents and expectations.

Political Environments

In those jurisdictions where teacher evaluation was seen as a local issue, it was perceived to be of a minor nature usually based on community dissatisfaction with an individual teacher. Significantly, no phase II respondent indicated that teacher evaluation had been a major political issue in their jurisdiction.

Political support for teacher evaluation does not appear to have been a grass roots phenomenon that was manifested through local political channels. The majority of school jurisdictions sampled have taken no action or minimal action to communicate to their publics about teacher evaluation policy implementation and thus engender greater community support for continued implementation of this policy initiative.

Socio-Economic Environments

This variable cluster was the most elusive to tap given the specific policy being studied and the context of implementation. None of the pilot questions in the phase II interviews survived the interview schedule development process to assess the socio-economic variable cluster directly. In addition, the background literature review did not identify local socio-economic factors as being important to the implementation of teacher evaluation policy. Essentially, factors which were identified as important seemed to be adequately covered by the other seven variable clusters of the Van Horn and Van Meter (1977) policy implementation model relative to the particular application of the model in the current study.

Disposition of the Implementors

Analysis of the crucial process variable, disposition of the implementors, of the Van Horn and Van Meter (1977) model revealed a substantial base of support for teacher evaluation policy by members of the teaching profession, but also the presence of a number of concerns, which if not addressed, could result in increasing resistance by teachers to implementation of teacher evaluation policy in Alberta.

Inadequate time for implementation of teacher evaluation policy was the most frequently mentioned item that had presented a problem to implementors. Perhaps most importantly, principal respondents, who are crucial to the teacher evaluation process, expressed their concern over inadequate time and resources twice as often as superintendent respondents. Teacher respondents identified this area as a problem for their principals almost as often as the principal respondents, lending credibility to the principal respondents' concerns.

Teacher and principal respondent categories also exhibited close agreement in terms of the numbers of responses relative to:

1) the need for evaluators to have more training and an improved empirical basis for evaluation; and 2) the existence of role confusion between summative and formative evaluative efforts and the lack of direction with respect to the overall teacher evaluation processes.

Fifty-nine of the ninety respondents believed the Department of Education's commitment to teacher evaluation policy implementation to be weaker or were not sure or held no opinion. Administrator respondents held this perspective more often than did teacher respondents.

At the local level superintendents perceive their school boards to be maintaining a high commitment to implementing teacher evaluation policy, with 25 of the 30 jurisdictions sampled reporting a high commitment by their boards to implementation of teacher evaluation policy. Concern was expressed by the researcher that ten of the boards with a high commitment are not seen by their superintendents to be actively demonstrating this commitment and an additional five of the thirty school boards sampled are percieved to have moderate or low commitment and are also not actively expressing a commitment to implementation of teacher evaluation policy. The perception of many policy implementors that the Department of Education's commitment is declining could be reinforced by a perception that board commitment is also declining.

Policy Effects

While large proportions of phase II administrator respondents identified evidence teaching was improving, staff satisfaction/positive teacher attitude, and administrative commitment to evaluation as indicators of successful policy implementation, very few teacher respondents identified these factors. On the other hand, two-thirds of the teacher respondents stated that evaluations that were informative/useful to them would be indicative of successful teacher evaluation policy implementation, whereas few administrators suggested this factor.

A small but similar proportion from each phase II respondent group suggested successful policy implementation would be indicated if public confidence in education was enhanced, and if the clarity and consistency in evaluation criteria were achieved. Nine administrator respondents also suggested enhancement of evaluation skills with resultant improvement in the quality of teacher evaluation, and six stated personnel decision making based on evaluation results would reflect successful teacher evaluation policy implementation.

The policy implementors conceptualization of successful policy implementation is relatively congruent with the idealized policy intents identified by the policy makers. Teacher satisfaction with teacher evaluation, useful and informative evaluations, and administrative commitment to teacher evaluation suggested by policy implementors would all be indicative of the institutionalization of teacher evaluation policy which policy makers stated would be an ideal condition. The former Minister of Education's objective of elimination of incompetent teaching and improvement of teaching quality is congruent with the implementors' identification of evidence that teaching was improving as an indicator of successful policy implementation. The implementors identification of improvement of public confidence in education is identical to the former Minister's stated objective of "contributing to increased public confidence in the educational system."

Numerous points of agreement appear to exist between the perspectives of policy makers and policy implementors regarding what ideal teacher evaluation policy implementation would be like. Granted, concensus likely does not exist on how to best achieve this idealized policy state, but the fact that multiple points of agreement exist between policy makers and implementors suggests that eventual full implementation of teacher evaluation policy is a reasonable objective.

Expectations for Full Implementation

In phase I interviews, policy makers were asked what their perceptions of the current status of teacher evaluation policy implementation were. Analysis of their responses indicated that policy makers do not believe teacher evaluation policy initiatives will dissipate; however, they also did not think that implementation is anywhere near complete.

Administrative policy implementors in phase II interviews were asked, how many schools, if any, have implemented the teacher evaluation policy, either fully or partly in their jurisdictions.

Twenty-three principal and nineteen superintendent respondents stated teacher evaluation policy had been fully implemented in their jurisdiction. Six of these forty-two respondents qualified their statement that "fully" meant in terms of the mechanics of the policy. That is, the policy standards were in place, but the policy effects, characteristics of the implementors, etc., may be yet lacking.

Seven principal and 11 superintendent respondents stated teacher evaluation policy had been partially implemented in their jurisdiction. These respondents often cited implementation barriers, such as time, the newness of the policy, or the discomfort of principals with it as factors which had inhibited full implementation.

The researcher was surprised that such a high proportion of administrator respondents (42/60) were willing to characterize teacher evaluation policy as fully implemented, despite the fact that earlier questions in the interview identified areas where implementation barriers existed. Essentially, most administrator respondents seemed comfortable with a fairly superficial definition of full policy implementation. This may have been due to the mandatory nature of teacher evaluation policy implementation that the provincial policy makers created and the resultant pressure on implementors to demonstrate full implementation.

Ironically, the interviews with the policy makers revealed that they believed teacher evaluation policy to be in the process of implementation, but that full implementation was a longer term process, and one that may require adjustments in terms of resources, characteristics of the implementing agencies, policy standards, and other factors, before full implementation could be expected.

A communication gap seems to exist between the expectations of the policy makers and the policy implementors relative to a realistic timeline for full implementation of teacher evaluation policy. This question of full implementation and the mechanisms required to achieve it, is a topic which will require further dialogue between policy makers and implementors.

Future Adjustments

The future will likely require the creation of mechanisms that will provide for more teacher involvement in the evolution of teacher evaluation processes in Alberta. In addition, the expertise base and resources in support of teacher evaluation will need enhancement. Court cases questionning the expertise of evaluators and collective agreement negotiations focusing on teacher evaluation procedures might also be future forces shaping teacher evaluation in the province.

Analysis of Teacher Evaluation Policies

The greatest similarities between the thirty policy documents analyzed involved the policy intent of improving instruction and the specification of various evaluation schedules relative to a teachers employee status. These were the only content areas which all thirty policy documents universally addressed. Most policies also addressed the disposition of teacher evaluation reports.

Moderate similarities, where between forty to eighty-five per cent of the documents concurred, included the policy intents of: personnel decisions, continous contract decisions, promotion, transfer and dismissal decisions, permanent certification decisions, affirmation or reinforcement of the teacher, and professional improvement. Formative and summative evaluation was defined in just over half of the documents and the roles of superintendents and principals were defined in eighty and eighty-three per cent of the policies respectively. Procedures for assisting teachers in difficulty or remedial processes were identified in sixty per cent of the documents. Self-evaluation and peer evaluation was encouraged in sixty-three per cent of the documents and post-conferences were required or suggested in eighty-three per cent of the policies. Teacher role expectations or the specific evaluation criteria were identified in eighty per cent of the policy documents.

Appeal procedures were present in most policies and in the three that excluded appeal procedures, one stated the possibility of appeal and another policy document was in the process of revision. Appeal procedures, however, demonstrated a marked lack of similarity with eighty per cent of the documents specifying appeal timelines, and only twenty-seven per cent explicitly stating the bases of appeal. Few documents identified provincial or federal appeal options which may exist outside the local appeal procedures, such as is defined in the Alberta School Act.

Minimal similarities existed between policy documents regarding: teachers' right to known, common evaluation criteria; the relationship of teacher evaluation to assessing jurisdictional inservice needs; roles of teachers within the evaluation process; and pre-conferencing requirements.

These minimally and moderately prevalent items within the policy documents represent potentially useful additions to policy documents which lack them, and as such offer a useful framework for future policy review by jurisdictional staff.

Policy requirements for mandatory evaluation of permanently certified, tenured teachers did not vary significantly from figures reported in a 1980 survey of teacher evaluation practices in Alberta (Alberta Education, 1980:13) which demonstrates that untenured or temporarily certificated teachers are the primary focus of current teacher evaluation policies.

Analysis of Teacher Evaluation Instruments

Evaluation instruments were also analyzed to determine the similarities and differences that existed between jurisdictions and to compare the internal structure and content of the instruments. Creation of a universal teacher evaluation instrument was not suggested; however, review of evaluation instruments by jurisdictional staff, using the categories noted below, is suggested to assure that evaluation instruments are as comprehensive as desired.

Twenty policy documents mandate teacher signatures as an indication that the individual teacher has seen and/or discussed the results of the evaluation. However, only sixteen of the evaluation instruments provide for this policy requirement.

Consolidated or summary reports, useful in focusing the evaluation results, and evaluation purposes, useful in clarifying the objectives of an evaluation, are included in twenty-three per cent of the instruments.

Few instruments included a statement about the appeal process. This item would be useful since many teachers may not have ready access to the appeal procedures defined in teacher evaluation policy documents. Few instruments included teacher role expectations; however, many instruments included evaluation criteria which accomplishes the same objective of clarifying the criteria on which teachers are evaluated.

Post conferences are required by most jurisdictions, but details regarding such conferences are included on only seven per cent of the evaluation instruments. Rating scales are included in half of the instruments, but are defined in only seven per cent of the instruments. Underlying philosophies are clarified in nearly half of the policy documents analyzed, but again such statements are present in just seven per cent of evaluation instruments.

Policy and Instrument Congruence with Study Findings

Congruence between study findings and policy documents and evaluation instruments was reviewed relative to policy intents, role responsibilities and preferred evaluation instrument formats.

Provincial policy (Alberta Education, 1984:72) specifically identifies the intent of ". . .professional growth and development of teachers." The almost total absence of this intent in the perception of policy implementors and in almost half of the policy documents represents an area in need of review by both policy makers and policy implementors.

Policy implementors were asked during phase II interviews if policy expectations were clear with respect to their role responsibilities. Administrator respondents expressed little confusion regarding their policy related responsibilities. Teachers, however, were the least clear regarding their teacher evaluation role responsibilities. The policy documents analysis revealed that superintendents and principals are most often identified as having specific role responsibilities. On the other hand, teachers' roles relative to teacher evaluation policy is addressed in only seventeen per cent of the policy documents. Inclusion of teacher role responsbililities in teacher evaluation policy documents would help to clarify teacher responsibilities.

Lastly, policy implementors were asked if they were satisfied with the methods used to measure teacher performance. The strongest single theme to emerge from this question was the preference expressed by many respondents for anecdotal evaluation reporting formats. The analysis of teacher evaluation documents found that anecdotal formats, used either independently or in conjuction with rating scales, occured in at least ninety per cent of the jurisdictions sampled. Use of anecdotal formats, identified as commonplace currently, should continue.

Recommendations for Theory

Policy implementation studies represent a method for conducting process evaluations before policy impact assessments or product evaluations should be conducted. Consequently, implementation studies can inform and help structure subsequent impact studies.

Any search for a single, predictive theory of policy implementation is likely to suffer the same fate as that of attempts to develop single, predictive theories of leadership or organizational behavior. That is, no single theory is likely to be sensitive to the complex, synergistic interaction between variables which are conditioned by the unique context of a particular organization or policy. Recognizing this, policy theorists should maintain an eclectic view of the policy implementation literature and subscribe to an adaptive theory which relates variables to the specific policy implementation environment which they are studying. Backward mapping (Elmore, 1979), and more traditional forward mapping techniques designed to assess the underlying causality of policies and policy objectives offer useful methods for assessing the variable clusters or policy theory which can optimally be used for study of a given policy context.

Policy implementation models such as Van Horn and Van Meter (1975, 1977) and Mazmanian and Sabatier (1981) are two examples of comprehensive frameworks that offer complex sets of variables at different levels of specificity which are potentially valuable to the study of policy implementation.

Recommendations for Practice

The following recommendations are made relative to the implementation of teacher evaluation policy in Alberta:

1) the often held perspective of local policy implementors that teacher evaluation policy adoption by the Alberta Department of Education was a short term reaction to a single event, the Keegstra affair, should be corrected with the view that policy adoption was a more legitimate long term reaction to multiple factors;

2) provincial policy objectives should be adjusted to recognize and support the more formative emphasis teacher evaluation has been given at the local level;

3) given the finding that the professional growth and development of teachers is generally not perceived as a policy

intent of current policy, this intent should either be dropped from policy or strategies identified that give clear and tangible support to this policy objective;

4) given the finding that implementors perceived provincial commitment dissipating, provincial interventions are needed to maintain a climate in which teacher evaluation policy implementation is perceived as being important;

5) given the finding that lack of time was frequently mentioned as a barrier to implementation, recognition that implementors may need assistance in more efficient use of their time to support teacher evaluation policy should become a priority of jurisdictions and the Department of Education;

6) given the finding that political motivation for teacher evaluation policy is stronger at the provincial level than at the local level, recognize that the disposition of implementors is not likely to be supported from the local political environment;

7) given the finding that implementation pressures related to the Keegstra affair are dissipating, this enforcement factor should be replaced with more normative incentives;

8) based on the Connecticut model, consideration should be given to expanding the role of the Council on Alberta Teaching Standards (COATS), or creating an independent board, to provide for on-going monitoring and/or assistance to jurisdictions in the implementation of teacher evaluation policy;

9) given the finding that articulation between the five provincial evaluation policies was often perceived by implementors to be unclear, the Department of Education should

review the five provincial evaluation policies included in the Management and Finance Plan in order to define an optimal, articicluated relationship between the five policies;

10) given the finding that many administrators reported difficulties in implementating teacher evaluation policy, recognize that evaluator expertise is developed over the long term and provide on-going mechanisms to facilitate continued evaluator skill development;

11) given the finding that teachers have had little opportunity for inservice regarding their roles relative to teacher evaluation consider prioritizing such inservice opportunities;

12) given the finding that anecdotal evaluation reporting formats are preferred by implementors and are also supported in the literature on teacher evaluation methodology (Shavelson, Webb, and Burstein, 1986), continue or incorporate such reporting formats where warranted and consider discontinuing use of rating scales;

13) given the finding that teachers are least clear regarding their teacher evaluation role responsibilities, provide for new opportunities for administrator-teacher collaboration at the local level to further define teacher understanding of the teacher evaluation goals and purposes;

14) given the finding that policies and instruments are potentially incomplete, jurisdictions should review their teacher evaluation policy documents and evaluation instruments relative to the variables identified in Chapter Eight of this study to

assure policies and instruments are as complete and fine tuned as is desirable;

15) given the finding that teachers report less involvement in policy development than perceived by administrators, as part of the policy and instruments review process, mechanisms should be considered which maximize teacher involvement in the process in order to increase the sense of teacher ownership of teacher evaluation policies and processes;

16) given the finding that appeal procedures in small districts present potential problems a staff resources list of approved and available personnel to supplement the appeal procedures of small school jurisdictions should be compiled and disseminated by the Department of Education;

17) given the finding that administrator implementors appear to feel a need to demonstrate a degree of implementation that is not congruent with the expectations of the policy makers, clarification of realistic timelines for full implementation by policy makers would be useful;

18) given the recognition that implementation studies should precede policy impact studies, begin planning the method, design and timeline of a policy impact assessment of teacher evaluation policies in Alberta using the current study and previous studies (Duncan, 1985) as baseline data, and provide for widespread dissemination of the impact study plan.

Recommendations for Further Research

In-house case studies by school jurisdictions using the phase II interview schedules employed in the present study would be useful to specific jurisdictions wishing to compare their jurisdictional teacher evaluation policy implementation status with the province wide findings reported above.

Further research into the local political environment via interviews or surveys of school board trustees regarding their perceptions of political pressures for teacher evaluation would add to our understanding of the role of trustees in the teacher evaluation policy process in particular and to the role of trustees in policy formulation in general.

The function of time as a barrier to implementation of teacher evaluation requires further study to identify how this barrier can best be addressed and reduced or eliminated as an impediment to teacher evaluation.

Further investigation of the Van Horn and Van Meter (1977) policy implementation model using quantitative research methodology and factor analytic validation techniques would be useful to further clarify the relevance of variable clusters to policy implementation studies in different settings.

Final Comment

A common word of advise found in the policy literature is the prescription to never assume a policy will be fully implemented on the basis that it has been formally adopted. The recommendations noted above underscore the tenuous nature of teacher evaluation policy implementation. Forces for and against implementation of teacher evaluation policy are becoming entrenched. The comments of one principal respondent are particularly poignant, "Teacher evaluation is such an abstract, nebulous area that you can avoid doing it without too much political damage." Whether a stalemate of mediocrity ensues or a new age of teacher professionalism emerges will be dependent on the actions of both policy makers and policy implementors over the next few years.

Bibliography

Alberta Education. Formal Evaluation of Teachers and
1985 Supervision of Instruction By Alberta School Principals. Planning Services, Edmonton.

Alberta Education. The Education of Teachers in
1984a Alberta: A Model For the Future. Edmonton.

Alberta Education. Program Policy Manual-2nd Edition
1984b Edmonton.

Alberta Education. Formal Evaluation of Certificated
1980 Education Staff in Alberta: Practices and Policies. Planning Services, Edmonton.

Alberta Education. Minister's Advisory Committee on
1979 Student Achievement. Edmonton.

Alberta Legislature. Report II on Professions and
1973 Occupations. Alberta Select Committee On Professions and Occupations. Edmonton.

Alberta School Trustees' Association. Teacher
1983 Evaluation: A Task Force Report, Edmonton.

Alberta School Trustees' Association. Teacher
1982 Performance Appraisal: A Position Paper. Edmonton.

Alberta Teachers' Association. "Nature of Teaching
1982 Profession," Members Handbook. p.210-212.

Alberta Teachers' Association. "Teacher Evaluation,"
1982 Members Handbook. p.227-229.

Allan, Edward Clayton. "Policy Making in a County: A
1985 Case Study in School System Governance," Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Alberta: Edmonton.

Almond, Gabriel A. and Powell, G. Bingham Jr.
1978 Comparative Politics. Boston: Little, Brown Press.

Barr, Avril S. "Measurement and Prediction of Teacher
1948 Efficiency," Journal of Experimental Education. Vol. 16, p203-283.

Berman, Paul. "The Study of Macro and Micro
1978 Implementation," *Public Policy*. Vol. 26, No. 2.

Bleecher, Harvey. "Educational Accountability in
1976 Michegan, Root and Branch," *Educational Administration Quarterly.* Vol. 12: No. 2, p38-50.

Bogdan, Robert C. and Sari Knopp Biklen. *Qualitative
1982 Research For Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Boltan, Dale L. "The Bases For Evaluating Teaching:
1979a Philosophy, Context and Purpose," in *Planning for the Evaluation of Teaching.* a CEDR Monograph, Phi Delta Kappa, NSPER.

Boltan, Dale L. "Planning for the Evaluation of
1979b Teaching: Guidelines and Principles," in *Planning for the Evaluation of Teaching.* a CEDR Monograph, Phi Delta Kappa, NSPER.

Borich, Gary D. "Evaluation Models: A Question of
1983 Purpose Not Terminology," *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*. Vol. 5, No. 1. pp.61-63.

Boyd, William Lowe. "Rethinking Educational Policy and
1983 Management: Political Science and Educational Administration in the 1980's," Deakin University Press. Victoria, Australia.

Brophy, Verna V. "Evaluation as Empty Comment,"
1984 Unpublished Masters Thesis. University of Alberta. Edmonton.

Brown, Robert D. "Helpful and Humane Teacher
1983 Evaluation," *Teacher Evaluation: Gathering and Using Data*. Phi Delta Kappa, CEDR. Willard R. Duckett, Ed. p. 9-26.

Bugher, Wilmer and Willard Duckett, eds. *Polling
1980 Attitudes of Community on Education Manual*. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa.

Cameron, Don. "The NEA Position on Testing In-Service
1985 Teachers," *Educational Measurement*. Vol. 4 No. 3.

Campbell, Rod. "Appropriate Outcomes of Evaluation
1985 (Panel Presentation)," Teacher Evaluation. A CTF Conference Report, Ottawa.

Capie, William. "Coming of Age: Systematic Performance
1985 Evaluation," Educational Measurement. Vol. 4, No. 3.

Carnegie Task Force. A Nation Prepared: Teachers for
1986 the 21st Century. Hyattsville, MD: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Chapman, Robin James. "The Nature and Role of Regional
1972 Offices of Education in the Province of Alberta," Unpublished Masters Thesis. University of Alberta: Edmonton.

Clark, Noel. "Approaches to Evaluation and
1982 Supervision: Proceed with Caution," Teacher Evaluation. A CTF Conference Report, Ottawa.

Coleman, Peter and Linda LaRocque. "Linking
1983 Educational Policy Via Policy-Relevant Research," Alberta Journal of Educational Research. Vol. XXIX, No.3. p.242-255.

Cross, Lawrence H. "Validation of the NTE Tests for
1985 Certification Decisions," Educational Measurement. Vol. 4, No. 3.

David, R.K. "The Firing of James Keegstra," The
1983 Canadian School Executive. May. p.19-21.

Dror, Yehezkel. Ventures in Policy Sciences. New
1971 York: American Elsevier Publishing Co. Inc.

Dror, Yehezkel. Design For Policy Sciences. New
1981 York: American Elsevier Publishing Co. Inc.

Duckett, Willard R., ed. Teacher Evaluation:
1983 Gathering and Using Data. Phi Delta Kappa, CEDR.

------ ed. The Competent Evaluator of Teaching.
1986 Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa.

Duke, Bill and Neil Fenske. "More Value for the
1985 Dollar," The ATA Magazine. Vol. 65, No. 2, p. 12-15.

Duncan, Andrew N. Teacher Evaluation Practices in
1984 Alberta. Alberta Education, Planning Services.

Duncan, Donald B. "Policy Recommendations Regarding
1986 Educational Administration in Alberta," Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. University of Alberta: Edmonton.

Dunn, William N. Public Policy Analysis: An
1981 Introduction. Prentice-Hall, Inc.: Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

DuVall, Lloyd A. "An Administrator Views the
1983 Evaluation of Teaching," Teacher Evaluation, Gathering and Using Data. Phi Delta Kappa, CEDR, W. R. Duckett, ed. p. 29-43.

Edwards III, George C. and Ira Sharkansky. The
1978 Policy Predicament - Making and Implementing Public Policy. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman.

Elmore, Richard F. "Backward Mapping: Implementation
1979 Research and Policy Decisions," Political Science Quarterly. Vol. 94. No. 4.

Fennell, Brian H. "The Determination of the Goals of
1985 Basic Education For Alberta: A Case Study in Political Decision-Making in Education," Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. University of Alberta: Edmonton.

Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in
1971 Psychology and Education, 3rd. ed.. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., Inc.

Finn, Chester E. "Better Principals Not Just
1986 Teachers," Principal. Vol. 65. No. 5.

Fisher, Thomas H. et al. "Testing Teachers for Merit
1985 Pay Purposes in Florida," Educational Measurement. Vol. 4, No. 3.

Friesen, David and Patrick Duignan. "How
1980 Superintendents Spend Their Working Time," The Canadian Administrator. 19:1-4.

Fuller, Bruce, Margaret M. Noel and David B. Malouf.
1985 "Polity and Competence: Can the State Change Teachers' Skills?" Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. 7:4 p. 343-353.

Gage, N.L. and R. Graconia. "Teaching Practices and
1981 Student Achievement: Causal Connections," New York University Education Quarterly. 12:3 p. 2-9.

Glickman, Carl D. and Edward F. Pajak. "Evaluating vs.
1986 Helping," The Canadian School Executive. Vol. 6, No. 3.

Good, Carter V. Essentials of Educational Research
1972 Methodology and Design, 2nd. ed.. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.

Gove, Samuel K., Frederick Wirt and William Walker.
1985 "Educational Policy," Policy Studies in America and Elsewhere. Lexington Books.

Grady, D.J. "Legal Dimensions of Teacher Evaluation,"
1982 Teacher Evaluation, a CTF Conference Report, Ottawa.

Greenfield, Barr and Baird, Richard. "The Politics of
1962a Education: Practice and Theory," The Canadian Administrator, Vol. 1, No. 7, April, p31-34.

Greenfield, Barr and Baird, Richard. "The Politics of
1962b Education: Controversy and Control," The Canadian Administrator, Vol. 1, No. 8, May, p35-38.

Grimmett, Peter P. "Teachers and Research on Teaching:
1982 Opportunities for Professional Growth," Teacher Evaluation. A CTF Conference Report, Ottawa.

Hall, Richard. Organizations: Structure and Process.
1982 (3rd. edition) Prentice-Hall.

Hansen, Susan B. "Public Policy Analysis: Some Recent
1983 Developments and Current Problems," Policy Studies Journal. 12(1). Sept. p14-43.

Harlton, Wayne. "Improving Teacher Effectiveness
1986 Through Supervision: A Grass Roots Approach," Council On School Administration Newsletter. Vol. 10. No. 1.

Hickcox, Edward S. "Dilemmas in Teacher Evaluation,"
1982 Paper Delivered at the Canadian Teachers' Federation Workshop on Teacher Evaluation, Ottawa, Ontario, May, 17-19.

Holmes Group. Tommorrows Teachers. East Lansing,
1986 MI: The Holmes Group.

Housego, Ian and Downey, Lorne. "The Governance of
1984 Public Schooling: Rethinking the Options," Policy Expectations, Centre for Policy Studies in Education, University of British Columbia, Vol 1, No. 2.

Iannacone, Laurance. "Three Views of Change in
1977 Educational Politics," The Politics of Education Seventy-sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, p. 255-286.

Iannacone, Laurance. "Emerging Philosophical and
1980 Ideological Issues in the Politics of Education," Values, Inquiry and Education. ed. Henduk D. Gideonse, et. al., Center for the Study of Evaluation, U.C.L.A., Los Angeles.

Ingram, E.J., et. al. "Information Package: The
1985 Management of Education in Alberta," University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Jesse, Ken and Alan Cooper. "This School Review
1986 Program Works," The Canadian School Executive. Vol. 6, No. 6.

Johnson, Terence J. "Types of Occupational Control,"
1982 Professions and Power. The MacMillan Press Ltd.: London.

Keeler, B.T. "The Secretary Reports - Teacher
1986 Evaluation Policy," The ATA Magazine. May.

Kerman, Joseph M. "James Keegstra and the Eckville
1986 High School Incident: A Chronology and Comment on Professional Response to Bigoted Teaching," The History and Social Science Teacher. Summer. p. 209-213.

King, David "Alberta's Management and Finance Plan,"
1984 The Canadian School Administrator. November.

Kungbehari, Lalta Lloyd. "Politics and Expertise in
1981 Policy Making: A Model and Case Study," Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. University of Alberta: Edmonton.

Larson, Magali Sarfatti. The Rise of
1977 Professionalism. University of California
Press: Berkeley.

Levin, Benjamin. "Improving the Quality of Education:
1986 An Alternative Approach," The Canadian
Administrator. Vol. 25, No. 6.

Long, John C. "The Transferability Issue in Alberta: A
1979 Case Study in the Politics of Higher
Education," Unpublished Doctoral
Dissertation, University of Alberta:
Edmonton.

Long, John C. "The Politics of Education: A Review,"
1982 Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
Canadian Association for the Study of
Educational Administration, Ottawa, Ontario.

Lutz, Frank W. "Methods and Conceptualizations of
1977 Political Power in Education," The Politics
of Education. Seventy-Sixth Yearbook of
the National Society for the Study of
Education, Part II. Chicago: University of
Chicago Press, pp. 30-66.

Lysaught, Jerome P. "Toward a Comprehensive Theory of
1984 Communications: A Review of Selected
Contributions," Educational Administration
Quarterly, Vol. 20, No. 3. p101-127.

Macdonald, James B. "Evaluation of Teaching: Purpose,
1979a Context, and Problems," Planning for the
Evaluation of Teaching, a CEDR Monograph,
Phi Delta Kappan - NSPER.

Macdonald, James B. "Planning for the Evaluation of
1979b Teaching," Planning for the Evaluation of
Teaching. a CEDR Monograph, Phi Delta
Kappan - NSPER.

Manatt, Richard P. "Competent Evaluators of Teaching:
1985 Their Knowledge, Skills, and Attitudes," in
The Competent Evaluation of Teaching.
William R. Duckett, Ed. Bloomington: Phi
Delta Kappa.

Mann, Dale. "Participation, Representation, and
1977 Control," The Politics of Education,
Seventy-Sixth Yearbook of the Society for the
Study of Education, Part II. Chicago:
University of Chicago Press, pp. 67-93.

March, M.E. *Variations in Degree of Control Over*
1981 *Educational Decisions*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Mazmanian, Daniel A. and Paul A. Sabatier eds.
1981 "The Implementation of Public Policy: A Framework of Analysis," *Effective Policy Implementation*. Toronto: D.C. Heath and Co.

Medley, Donald, Robert Soar and Homer Coker. "The
1984 Minimum Conditions for Valid Evaluation of Teacher Performance," *Journal of Classroom Interaction*. Vol. 19, No. 1. p22-27.

Meyer, John W. and Rowan, Brian. *Environments and*
1978 *Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mintzberg, Henry. *The Structuring of Organizations*.
1979 Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Mireau, Laurie. "Evaluating and Improving Teaching
1985 Performance: Inservice Kit," *Planning* Services. Alberta Education, Edmonton.

------ "Recognizing and Developing Effective Teaching
1986 Practices," *The Canadian School Executive*. Vol. 6, No. 5. p.13-15.

Mitchell, Douglas E. and Spady, William G. "Authority,
1983 Power and the Legitimation of Social Control," *Educational Administration Quarterly*. Vol. 19, No.1, p5-33.

Mosher, Edith K. "Education and American Federalism:
1977 Intergovernmental and National Policy Influences," in *NSSE Handbook*. p94-123.

Muth, Rodney. "Toward an Integrative Theory of Power
1984 and Educational Organizations *Educational* Administration Quarterly, Vol. 2, No. 2, p25-42.

Naisbitt, John. *Megatrends*. New York: Warner Books.
1984

National Commission on Excellence in Education,
1983 *A Nation At Risk*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Newcombe, Judith P. and Clifton F. Conrad. "A Theory
1981 of Mandated Academic Change," *Journal of Higher Education*. Vol. 52, No. 6.

O'Toole, Laurence J. jr. "Policy Recommendations for
1986 Multi-Actor Implementation: An Assessment of the Field," Journal of Public Policy. Vol. 6, No. 2. p.181-210.

Papagiannis, George J., et. al. "Toward a Political
1982 Economy of Educational Innovation," Review of Educational Research. Vol. 52., No. 2. p. 245-290.

Peters, Frank. "Assessing Models of Change: A Case
1986 Study Analysis," Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. University of Alberta: Edmonton.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey. "The Micropolitics of
1978 Organizations," Environments and Organizations. J.W. Meyer and B. Rowan eds. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Podemski, Richard S. and Cherie K. Loh. "Why We Are
1985 Testiong Teachers: Some Policy Issues," Educational Measurement. Vol. 4, No. 3.

Popham, James W. "Recertification Tests for Teachers,"
1985 Educational Measurement. Vol 4, No. 3.

------ "Teacher Evaluations: Mission Impossible,"
1986 Principal. Vol. 65, No. 4. p.56-58.

Reikie, M. J. "Policies and Practices Used in Preparing the
1977 Formal Evaluation of Teachers in Alberta," Unpublished Master's Thesis. University of Alberta: Edmonton.

Report II on Professions and Occupations
1973 Alberta Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly on Professions and Occupations, December.

Riffel, J. Anthony. "A Developmental Perspective on
1987 School Improvement," The Canadian Administrator. Vol. 26, No. 4. p.1-5.

Rubin, Louis. Formulating Education Policy in the
1984 Aftermath of the Reports," Educational Leadership. Vol. 42, No. 2.

Sackney, Larry E. "Administrative Dilemmas of the
1980 Principal," The Canadian Administrator. Vol. XX, No. 3.

Scheirer, Mary Ann and Rezmovic, Eva Lantos. 1983 "Measuring the Degree of Program Implementation," Evaluation Review. Vol.7, No. 5, October, p599-633, Sage Publications, Inc.

Scott, W. Richard. Organizations: Rational, Natural 1981 Open Systems. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Scribner, Jay D. and Englert, Richard M. "The Politics 1977 of Education: An Introduction," The Poltitics of Education, Seventy-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. p. 1-29.

Scriven, Michael. "A Different Approach to Teacher 1979 Evaluation," in Planning for the Evaluation of Teaching. a CEDR Monograph, Phi Delta Kappa, NSPER.

Seguin, Jean J. "Public Policy Planning in Education: 1977 A Case Study of Policy Formation For the Early Childhood Services Program in Alberta," Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. University of Alberta: Edmonton.

Seidman, William H. "Goal Ambiguity and Organizational 1983 Decoupling: the Failure of 'Rational Systems' Program Implementation," Educational Evaluation and Program Policy Analysis. 5:4.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. "Landscapes, Mindscapes, and 1985 Reflective Practice in Supervision," Journal of Curriculum and Supervision. Vol. 1, No. 1. p.5-17.

Shavelson, Richard J., Noreen M. Webb and Leigh 1986 Burstein. "Measurment of Teaching," in Handbook of Research on Teaching, 3rd. Edition. Merlin C. Wittrock, ed. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.

Small, Michael Willoughby. "A Case Study in 1979 Educational Policy Making: The Establishment of Athabasca University," Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. University of Alberta: Edmonton.

Smith, Thomas B. "The Policy Implementation Process," 1973 Policy Sciences. June, p197-209.

Soar, Robert S., Donald M. Medley and Homer Coker.
1983 "Teacher Evaluation: A Critique of Currently Used Methods," Phi Delta Kappan. Vol. 65, No. 4.

Stiggins, Richard J. "Teacher Evaluation:
1986 Accountability and Growth Systems - Different Purposes," NASSP Bulletin. Vol. 70, No. 490. p.51-58.

Strike, Kenneth A. and Jason Millman. "Non-Technical
1983 Questions About Teacher Evaluation Systems in Elementary and Secondary Schools: A Research Agenda," Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. Vol. 5, No. 4. p.389-397.

Taylor, William H. "The Evolution of a Policy-Making
1980 System: A Case in University Governance," Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. University of Alberta: Edmonton.

Thomas, Donald M. Performance Evaluation of
1979 Educational Personnel. Phi Delta Kappa Fastback: Bloomington, Indiana.

Townsend, David. Teacher Evaluation in Secondary
1984 Schools. Alberta Education, Planning Services, Edmonton.

Tuohy, Carolyn. "The Struggle for Professional Power,"
1981 Policy Options. March/April, p34-40.

Tymko, Joseph Lawrence. "Accreditation of Alberta
1979 Senior High Schools: A Case Study of Public Policy Implementation," Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. University of Alberta: Edmonton.

Ulrich, Tom. "Firing Johnny's Teacher Isn't That
1986 Hard!" The Manitoba Teacher. Vol. 64. No. 4.

Van Horn, Carl E. and Donald S. Van Meter. "The
1977 Implementation of Intergovernmental Policy," Policy Studies Review Annual. Vol. 1., Stuart S. Nagel, ed. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

------ "The Policy Implementation Process," Administration
1975 and Society. Vol. 6. No. 4.

Vold, David J. "The Roots of Teacher Testing in
1985 America," Educational Measurement. Vol. 4, No. 3.

Walberg, Herbert J. "Synthesis of Research on
1986 Teaching," in Handbook of Research on Teaching. 3rd. Edition. Merlin C. Wittrock, Ed. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.

Williams, Walter. "Implementation Analysis and
1975 Assessment," Policy Analysis. Vol. 1. No. 3.

Wise, Arthur E., et.al. "Teacher Evaluation: A Study of
1985 Effective Practices," The Elementary School Journal. Vol. 86, No. 1

Wood, Carolyn J. and Paul A. Pohland. "Teacher
1979 Evaluation the Myth and Realities," in Planning for the Evaluation of Teaching. a CEDR Monograph, Phi Delta Kappa, NSPER.

Yates, Douglas T. jr. "The Mission of Public Policy
1977 Programs: A Report on Recent Experience," Policy Sciences. Vol. 8. p.363-373.

Appendix A

Implementation of Teacher Evaluation Policy
Teacher Interview Schedule

1. Would you share with me your general thoughts on teacher evaluation policy implementation in your school?

2. What do you believe are the purposes of the teacher evaluation policy at the provincial level?

3. What, in your opinion, are the purposes of your jurisdiction's teacher evaluation policy?

4. What would you look for in making a decision as to whether the policy has been sucessfully implemented in your school?

5. Have you had any training specifically in teacher evaluation?

   What training has been most helpful?

   What training would be helpful?

6. To what degree are you satisfied with your jurisdiction's methods used to measure teacher performance?

7. What means have been used in your school to encourage teachers to cooperate with the teacher evaluation policy?

How effective have these been?

8. Has anything weakened your support for implementation of your jurisdiction's teacher evaluation policy?

9. Have any aspects of the teacher evaluation policy caused implementation difficulties for your school's administrative staff?

10. In what way were the teachers involved in developing your jurisdiction's teacher evaluation policy?

11. Are policy expectations from the school office sufficiently clear from your point of view to define what is expected of you in the implementation process?

12. Do you think the Alberta Department of Education's commitment to having the provincial teacher evaluation policy implemented is as strong today as it was in 1984-85 when it was introduced?

What are the reasons for this opinion?

13. Are there any future needs, supports or adjustments which you think may be necessary to assure teacher evaluation has a positive influence in your school?

Appendix B

Implementation of Teacher Evaluation Policy
Principal Interview Schedule

1. Would you share with me your general thoughts on teacher evaluation policy implementation in your jurisdiction?

2. What do you believe are the purposes of the teacher evaluation policy at the provincial level?

3. What, in your opinion, are the purposes of your jurisdiction's teacher evaluation policy?

4. What would you look for in making a decision as to whether the policy has been sucessfully implemented in your jurisdiction?

5. Have you had any training specifically in teacher evaluation?

   What training has been most helpful?

   What training would be helpful?

6. Have the teachers in your school had any specific training to facilitate and cooperate with teacher evaluation?

   What training has been most helpful?

   What training would be helpful?

7. To what degree are you satisfied with your jurisdiction's methods used to measure teacher performance?

8. What means have been used in your jurisdiction to encourage principals to implement the teacher evaluation policy?

   How effective have these been?

9. What means have been used in your school to encourage teachers to cooperate with the teacher evaluation policy?

   How effective have these been?

10. Has anything weakened your support for implementation of your jurisdiction's teacher evaluation policy?

11. Have any aspects of the teacher evaluation policy implementation resulted in resistance by teachers?

12. In what way were the teachers involved in developing your jurisdiction's teacher evaluation policy?

13. Has the 'due process' requirement of the Alberta Department of Educaton caused implementation difficulties in your jurisdiction?

14. Are policy expectations from the central office sufficiently clear from your point of view to define what is expected of you in the implementation process?

15. How has implementation been affected by the jurisdiction's political climate? For example, was teacher evaluation an issue in the October 20, 1986 board elections?

16. Have you tried to make parents or parent groups aware that a new teacher evaluation policy is being implemented in your school? How effective has this been?

17. In your judgement, how many schools, if any, have implemented the teacher evaluation policy? Partly_______? Fully_______?

18. Do you think the Alberta Department of Education's commitment to having the provincial teacher evaluation policy implemented is as strong today as it was in 1984-85 when it was introduced?

What are the reasons for this opinion?

19. Are there any future needs, supports or adjustments which you think may be necessary to assure teacher evaluation has a positive influence in your school?

Appendix C

Implementation of Teacher Evaluation Policy Superintendent Interview Schedule

1. Would you share with me your general thoughts on teacher evaluation policy implementation in your jurisdiction?

2. What do you believe are the purposes of the teacher evaluation policy at the provincial level?

3. What, in your opinion, are the purposes of your jurisdiction's teacher evaluation policy?

4. What would you look for in making a decision as to whether the policy has been sucessfully implemented in your jurisdiction?

5. The Alberta Department of Education has used "must do" statements to ensure that school jurisdictions implement teacher evaluation policy. What has been your reaction to the appropriateness of these means used to ensure compliance with provincial mandates to implement teacher evaluation policies?

6. Would you recommend other means to ensure compliance with the provincial policy?

7. Who has responsibility for evaluating teachers in your jurisdiction?

8. Have the central office administrative/supervisory staff in your jurisdiction had had any training specifically in teacher evaluation?

    What training has been most helpful?

    What training would be helpful?

9. Have the school based administrative/supervisory staff in your jurisdiction had any training specifically in teacher evaluation?

    What training has been most helpful?

    What training would be helpful?

10. Have the teachers in your jurisdiction had any specific training to facilitate and cooperate with teacher evaluation?

What training has been most helpful?

What training would be helpful?

11. To what degree are you satisfied with your jurisdiction's methods used to measure teacher performance?

12. What means have been used in your jurisdiction to encourage principals to implement the teacher evaluation policy?

How effective have these been?

13. What means have been used in your jurisdiction to encourage teachers to cooperate with the teacher evaluation policy?

How effective have these been?

14. What is the priority of evaluating teachers for board members?

15. Has anything weakened your support for implementation of your jurisdiction's teacher evaluation policy?

16. Have any aspects of the teacher evaluation policy implementation resulted in resistance by teachers?

17. In what way were the teachers involved in developing your jurisdiction's teacher evaluation policy?

18. Has the 'due process' requirement of the Alberta Department of Educaton caused implementation difficulties in your jurisdiction?

19. Are policy expectations from the Alberta Department of Education sufficiently clear from your point of view to define what is expected of you in the implementation process?

20. How has implementation been affected by the jurisdiction's political climate? For example, was teacher evaluation an issue in the October 20, 1986 board elections?

21. Have you tried to make parents or parent groups aware that a new teacher evaluation policy is being implemented in your jurisdiction? How effective has this been?

22. In your judgement, how many schools, if any, have implemented the teacher evaluation policy? Partly_______? Fully_______?

23. Do you think the Alberta Department of Education's commitment to having the provincial teacher evaluation policy implemented is as strong today as it was in 1984-85 when it was introduced?

What are the reasons for this opinion?

24. Are there any future needs, supports or adjustments which you think may be necessary to assure teacher evaluation has a positive influence in your jurisdiction?

Appendix D

University of Alberta
Edmonton

Department of Educational Administration
Faculty of Education

Canada T6G 2G5

7-104 Education Building North, Telephone (403) 432-5241

September 5, 1986

I am presently conducting a study of teacher evaluation policy implementation in Alberta. The project has received funding support from Alberta Education and is being undertaken as a doctoral study in the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Alberta.

Phase 1 of the study has involved interviews with decision makers and other persons who were influential in the adoption of teacher evaluation policy. The primary purpose of the first phase of the study was to identify the intents of teacher evaluation policy.

Phase 2 of the study will assess the effects of teacher evaluation policy implementation. Information for this phase will be collected in interviews with personnel form various Alberta School Jurisdictions.

The purpose of this letter is to ask permission to interview you and two other individuals in your jurisdiction. Anonymity of respondents will be assured, and the data will be reported without identifying responses with individual respondents or their jurisdictions.

Interviews will last approximately one hour with the superintendent or his designate responsible for teacher evaluation policy implementation. In addition, a principal and a teacher, randomly selected from the jurisdiction, will be interviewed. Interviews are tentatively planned for late September, October, and November 1986.

The results of the study will be reported to the Planning Services Branch of Alberta Education. Results, it is anticipated, will be distributed to all school jurisdictions in the province.

If your jurisdiction agrees to participate in the study, may I request (1) an up to date staff list to facilitate selection of a principal and teacher for interviews, and (2) a copy of your teacher evaluation policy document. Once all participating jurisdictions are confirmed, I will contact you so we may agree upon an interview schedule.

Thank you for considering this request. If there are any questions regarding the study, please do not hesitate to contact me (432-3094 on campus or 458-6064 residence). I will look forward to recieving your reply.

Sincerely,

John M. Burger

Appendix E

Alberta 75

EDUCATION

Devonian Building, West Tower
11160 Jasper Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
T5K 0L2

January 30, 1980

To Alberta School System
Superintendents

Recently the Canadian Education Association, in cooperation with a number of other educational agencies, held a seminar on inservice and retraining of teachers and administrators. The seminar included representation from the major educational sectors across Canada and input from political and manpower specialists.

In the absence of more substantial evidence, seminar participants relied on their perceptions in concluding that few comprehensive personnel development programs for educators exist in Canada and that a major barrier to providing adequate professional development programs for teachers and administrators is the lack of comprehensive ongoing evaluation programs for them. Reinforcement of competent or outstanding teachers appears inadequate. In general, evaluation of teachers and administrators occurs only in the first two years of service in a position, during temporary appointment, or in crisis situations. In the crisis cases data often are not adequate as a basis for decisions on termination. Ad hoc solutions seem to be the order of the day, and too often termination rather than improved performance is the major objective. Except for Quebec, where after two years of successful teaching a teacher has life tenure although not permanent job placement, policies on teacher redundancy generally are of a "last in, first out" nature.

If the situation as outlined pertains in Alberta school systems also, then improvement in personnel management procedures is essential. Until 1970 the province had ongoing evaluation of teachers, with written reports considered an integral part of the teacher personnel file and deposited both locally and in the Registrar's office. Since 1970 the prime responsibility for teacher evaluation has rested with local jurisdictions. A 1977 study conducted by Dr. E.A. Holdaway and Mr. M.J. Reikie of the University of Alberta indicated that a substantial percentage (36%)

. . . 2

of Alberta School jurisdictions had no policy on frequency of evaluations of tenured teachers, and only 29% of jurisdictions had standard forms for use in conducting and reporting such evaluations. There are no more recently collected data on the situation.

The purpose of this letter is to obtain from you an outline of the evaluation policies and procedures followed for all certificated personnel in your school system. A copy of relevant policy and procedures statements, with any attendant forms, would be appreciated. In addition I request that, whether or not you have such statements, you complete and return the attached brief questionnaire, which will facilitate summarizing the current situation in the province.

May I have this information by February 18, 1980 please.

Sincerely,

E.K. Hawkesworth
Deputy Minister of
Education

c.c. Board Chairmen